Presencing Of Being

And

Other Essays

The Rovero Estate

Authored books by
Joshua Kyle T. Rovero

The Basic Philosophy of Joshua Rovero
Essays on Civilization
The Other Treatises
The New Societies of Mankind
Presencing of Being and Other Essays

Collected Stories of Joshua Rovero

PRESENCING OF BEING AND OTHER ESSAYS

Presencing Of Being

And

Other Essays

The Rovero Estate
2025

The
Rovero Estate

Contact: estado.rovero@gmail.com

Philippines, 2025

First Edition, the Rovero Estate. General Santos City, South Cotabato, Philippines, April 29th 2025

"Presencing of Being and Other Essays" by The Rovero Estate is licensed under CC BY 4.0

The greatest gift to mankind for all.

And also dedicated to a blessed individual to be honored accordingly: Andrea Uy.

Table of Contents

Preface 1

Chapter One (Presencing of Being) 14

I. Introduction to the Presencing of Being..... 14

II. Interpreting Maimonides' Fourth Precept 22

Chapter Two (Highest Good)..... 31

I. Introduction to the Highest Good 31

II. Everything is the Highest Good 37

III. The Existential Essence of Life 43

Chapter Three (Problem of Universals) .. 52

Chapter Four (Three Modes of Politics) . 64

I. Introduction 64

II. Politics of Personalities 71

III. Politics of Ideologies..... 73

IV. Politics of Civilizations..... 78

V. Conclusion..... 81

Chapter Five (Reverence for Death) 88

I. The Spectacle of Death 88

II. The Reverence for Death 92

III. Existential Dread 97

IV. Conclusion 103

Chapter Six (Heideggerian Mathematics and Proving 10 is a Solitary Number) 106

I. Prolegomena to Heideggerian Mathematics *106*

II. Introduction to Heideggerian Mathematics *108*

III. Proving the basic Mathematic set: 1+1=2 ..... *113*

IV. The Mathematical Structure of Heideggerian Mathematics *123*

V. The Concepts of a Friendly Number and a Solitary Number *133*

VI. 'Is 10 a Solitary Number?' (Part one): The background of an unsolved problem, and its attempts to solve it *137*

VII. 'Is 10 a Solitary Number?' (Part two): Our solution to the problem *139*

VIII. Further expositions on the Solitude of 10 ..... *143*

Bibliography 160

Chapter One *161*

Chapter Two *162*

Chapter Three *163*

Chapter Four *164*

Chapter Five *166*

Chapter Six *169*

About the Author 172

PREFACE

When a man thinks with his own worldview, he is by nature, curious – curious about the worldview he or she subscribes to. This curiosity leads to thinking, and thinking leads to development, and development leads to maturity.

It is no wonder than in every revolutionary age where philosophers are marked with the spark of the philosopher, it always undergoes the process of thinking, thinking about the world and conceptualizing it to see the consistency and testing the waters of strength in regards to the interpretation about the world given.

The beauty of thinking alone gave mankind gifts, a thousand gifts to lead humanity towards the end of the examined life – the last poetic fulfillment of what it means to know.

The aim of the philosopher then, is to think.

Thinking in terms of world-disclosure; that is what we are, as humans experiencing the rawness of the world that exists in front of our eyes. This is what comes the march of true progress unfolding in our eyes, to be bathed in the light of ideas; yes, that is what we are, and its beautiful consequences.

In thinking lies the creation and improvement of new ideas to further and develop the worldview. In thinking alone lies true life: the true life being engaging in the realm of knowing so that we reach the ultimate bliss of life: the end of all examined lives is the fulfillment of total aletheia, of total world-disclosure.

Have we reached true development? No, quite so: but are we going towards it? Yes, it is, for our continued thirst and quest for thinking is what has all led us to this great moment in human history against the dullness of this world.

And here I am, marching towards that development.

In this new book, *Presencing of Being and Other Essays,* which is precisely to be regarded as a 'sequel' to my *Basic Philosophy of Joshua Rovero*, is to be regarded as a new evolutionary line of thought but still rooted at the core. This drive to further expand on what was already thought is necessary in order to bring new concepts to arise from the old works – in short, expanding the theory to become even richer than ever.

It is, in some ways, a form of supercession to my old work. But without the old work, one can never understand the new concepts – but as much as possible, it refrains to repeat the old concepts; it only embodies them. We do not discard or replace it entirely, but to improve by way of conceptualizing new concepts.

At the heart of this book lies the greatest idea ever had to grace my philosophy and possibly, the world. This idea is the Presencing of Being, which is now central and integrated to my philosophical worldview provided within.

The concept of the Presencing of Being is a new thing: it is derived from further introspection of the old ideas, precisely how does the 'things' inside the Totality work accordingly. From there came the birth of new ideas, simply because a new concept is disclosed in the world to me via the Hypermaterial in itself.

This period from then on is to be regarded as the *Second Generation* of my philosophical worldview; the books before it were part of the *First Generation* of my first philosophical worldview.

However, unlike other philosophers such as Auguste Comte, where out of shameful spite divided himself into two Comtes, one a 'good' Comte and a 'bad' Comte, where the contradictions in his thought were masked by this artificial division to preserve a false sense of coherence, mine is of a different approach: *separate but whole*. This new generation of my philosophical worldview does not mean a betrayal of the foundations, but rather an

honest evolution-one that carries the core intact while allowing it to breathe in new intellectual air.

Another thing to notice is my unorthodox style of writing books, which some may find it disorienting. This unorthodoxy in writing books is what characterizes me against the uninspiring regime of bureaucratic, by-the-book approach to philosophy that is characterized by the regimentation of the philosophical field today. Philosophy in the time of Plato was not like this: what I mean here is that philosophy, in its truest and rawest form, was once the living breath of inquiry - dialogical, poetic, erratic, and profoundly personal. It was not bound by academic decorum or shackled by the pressures of peer-reviewed approval, which made it stale and heartbreaking at times – in fact, it suppresses discourse and questioning; rather, it danced freely with myth, politics, metaphysics, and irony. What I mean here is

that philosophy was once a lived art, not a sterile profession - a flame passed between impassioned minds, not a set of jargonized terms stored in institutional vaults.

Philosophy was supposed to be the epitome of actual rationality, not this dismal annoying echo chamber of endlessly recycled citations and blind allegiance to stale paradigms. I state it here again: *Philosophy was supposed to be the epitome of actual rationality, not this calcified repetition of intellectual bureaucracy masquerading as thought.* True rationality is dynamic, living, and self-critical - not fearful of ambiguity, not allergic to poesis, not disgusted by the messiness of contradiction. The task of the philosopher is not to resolve all contradiction, but to live within it, to think through it, and to reveal its hidden logic - its disclosive power.

It is this quality that separates and (becomes superior to) the Hypermaterial, whose domain is Philosophy, to the other two spheres of existence: the Material, whose domain is Science, and the

Immaterial, whose domain is Theology. Science, for all its scientific method and Theology, for all its revelatory learning, often fall into the trap of closure - the closure of sealing off the true unknown. Philosophy, as I practice and envision it, dwells in the rupture, in the unresolvable space between these two. Instead, it asks: *What is it to live between these poles? What is it to remain open, exposed, unfinished?* The Hypermaterial is thus not a middle ground but a higher purified synthesis - not a compromise, but a confrontation. It is the battleground of thought itself, where the mind is neither enslaved to matter nor lost in abstraction, but engaged in the risky act of meaning-making.

And this is why my writing cannot - will not - obey the protocols of conventionality. To do so would be to betray the Hypermaterial; to betray philosophy.

To avenge this betrayal, Philosophy must return back to what was once before

long ago: unlike the bureaucratic pestilence modern academia, where thought is suffocated beneath layers of standardization and dogmatic rule, philosophy must reclaim its original dynamism. It must break free from the rigid scaffolding that has imprisoned it, returning once again to the fertile, fertile soil of the uncharted and the unknown. In reclaiming this, we do not return to the safety of old doctrines, nor to some mythic past of simplistic answers; rather, we return to the brave chaos of thought as an experience - raw, untamed, and fearless. To reduce philosophy to a mere academic exercise - to make it sterile, to render it void of passion and paradox - is to dishonor its most essential qualities. It is to forget that philosophy is not a static thing, but a living process. A process that must breathe, change, and grow with each new generation of thinkers. It is to forget that true thought must always be uncomfortable, it must always push against the boundaries of the known, to venture

into the spaces where certainty dissolves, where only the fragile threads of possibility remain.

So, if my writing unsettles, if it disorients and frustrates - let it be known that it is not for lack of rigor or care, but rather because it seeks to provoke thought in its truest form: a thought that is alive, that is always in motion, that does not fear the unknown, and does not seek the easy comforts of closure. For in the face of this radical openness, we might finally begin to touch the true heart of philosophy that which was once, long ago, an art of living- not merely an academic discipline, but a living, breathing expression of human inquiry.

This book is a true labor of love from a philosopher who has just witnessed itself to be born and be reborn in this postmodern age, is a product of the power of thinking about the world's nature and being within itself.

This book was written at a time when the feeling of closure begins to unfold in front of myself, the beginning of things to come: not only to my philosophy and its worldview, but in personal life as well. When the *Basic Philosophy of Joshua Rovero* was written, I was a second-year student of Mindanao State University (the General Santos City branch, NOT the main campus which is in Marawi City) who had just begun to plant the seeds of enlightened development, to mature the philosophical worldview – but first, I thought, I need a core book to provide a staging point for a new philosophy to emerge. Since then, I have published four books in total – *The Basic Philosophy of Joshua Rovero, Essays on Civilization, The Other Treatises,* and my last book: *The New Societies of Mankind*. These books are part of the *First Generation* of my philosophical (and political) worldview, for they are the first books that now serve as a core part of what constitutes the core essence of what makes my worldview.

Now, the *Second Generation*, starting with this book, are what I can regard it as 'expansions' to my core worldview, one surpassing them but still rooted in them. The Second Generation of books will be the new heralds of my worldview! This book, *Presencing of Being and Other Essays*, was already started in February 2025, and now I am a third-year student who, like a growing plant, become stronger, more expansive, and more attuned to the nature of reality that I seek to comprehend further. The ideas that began as seeds in the earlier works have now begun to manifest deeper roots, reaching further into the soil of human experience and thought.

And with this book, this becomes a new staging point fit for the introduction of new concepts that will be integral to the understanding of our great aim of world-disclosure: our greatest purpose, our greatest task. This shall be the birth of a new laborious period in the continued development of modern philosophy.

In my continuing quest to examine life and to disclose the world, I shall pursue; to philosophize is to be human, the only way to restore the soul of man towards the real experience of peace, and to fulfill our greatest duty.

And indeed, this goal is beautiful – and I shall remain a philosopher until the very end.

I possess a great mind to behold in heaven. God's gift, truly.

Joshua Kyle T. Rovero
April 12th 2025

Chapter One

Presencing of Being

I. Introduction to the Presencing of Being

The Presencing of Being is one of the most notable concept of our philosophical system. This concept states that for a being to become itself, one must have a presence within being that acts as if it was its own being. That is the fundamental concept that underlies the essence of philosophy. This 'presence' is a force, a force that acts that makes the being act on its own; the being, because of its presence in the world, will self-disclose it to the world. The aletheia, as understood, acts because of its own nature of being: it is revealed to us by its presence in the world. All objects - beings - act like this: there is no object that cannot presence itself in the world, for the moment the being exists by its own manner of disclosure, it triggers a Presencing of Being due to the act of existence

alone. The other that perceives the being is already in its presence; when it exists, so comes itself forth into the world, no excuses. It acts as its own; it acts like it exists, because it exists. This is the Presencing of Being that is a common law in our current existence as it stands today.

The presence of a bag in a chair in the middle of the park is one example. The bag in the chair acts as a bag; its presencing near the chair acts as if it was a bag. It still has the same qualities as a bag, yes, but since in its current state of existence it acts upon itself due to the presence of the chair, so the Presencing of Being must act through itself as disclosure of its own. Therefore, the bag, as it was understood presences its own being-and in so doing, it reveals not merely that it is a bag, but that it is this bag, here, now, within a relational field of worldhood that gives its being a context, a significance, and a self-asserting presence that cannot be denied. Its someone's bag, sure - someone made the chair, sure (of course!), but you cannot deny that the bag and

chair - but the bag is, of course - exists and is present in the world. Therefore, the Presencing of Being in the chair (and by itself) is the fact the bag acts as if it was a bag, so therefore, it is, in fact, a bag.

No one can deny this concept.

All organisms, things, objects, concepts, ideas - or beings - have their own Presencing of Being that acts as if it was itself. The itself is itselfing; it acts, that assures us. The being is its own world-disclosure. The reason why Dasein is present is because of its Sein. Existence is composed of beings, and the beings act in existence: experience in existence, which is what it is. Existence - Dasein - is at a state of normality; it has no Presencing of Being because when something exists, it is because of existence. Existence acts as if it exists, but never its own being, for it creates an environment that makes beings exist in the first place! Existence exists, yes, but it wants to exist: existence acts as if it exists. It wants to exist through creation, an act of self-creation. Self-creation in the sense

of 'assisted creation': the drive for its own existence is its own want to exist. Therefore, the imperative of existence: for existence to exist, it must exist on its own.

There is a reason why, in every act of creation as in the religious chronologies of many religions, existence already exists. Sometimes, an act of self-creation also necessitates the aid of being to hasten its own existence: existence needs being, and to exist it needs beings that can presence itself so that existence has meaning: the meaning of being as world-disclosure. That is its will.

The first two lines of the Christian Bible explains this predicament of ours: The first line, Genesis 1:1 (Lamsa Translation)[1] - 'God created the heavens and the earth in the very beginning.' and the second line, Genesis 1:2 (Lamsa Translation)[1] - 'And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the water.' are exemplaries of existence and the Presencing of Being. To explain: existence is rendered in

the first line as a creative act that affirms the totality of being-the heavens and the earth are not simply summoned into place mysteriously, but are brought forth through the very will-to-be that underscores all presencing; the second line then introduces the primordial condition, a void without form, which is not yet presence but potential-a liminal state in which being has not yet disclosed itself, where existence remains undifferentiated and inert until the "Spirit of God moved upon the face of the water," a movement that symbolizes the stirring of presencing itself, the initial act of world-disclosure that ignites being into becoming, that transforms void into world, into Totality, that enacts the essential unfolding of all beings into a shared field of appearance; thus, this divine motion is not merely religious metaphor but a metaphysical gesture: the call of being to presence itself, the necessity of a force, a will, that renders being intelligible within existence, for even God, in this telling, participates in the Presencing of Being-not

merely as a creator but as the first observer, the first relational participant in a world that only becomes meaningful through the Presencing of Beings who can presence themselves.

And so comes the rest that we know of: God then creates Totality and all of the beings within.

Beyond the Immaterial discourse, so goes the Material discourse too.

The first lines of : The first line, page 87 (Zhu et al., 2023) - 'The brief standard content of the big bang theory is that the universe started at a singularity, where "time and space are meaningless."[2]'; and the second line, pages 87-89 (Zhu et al., 2023) - 'At the same time, both the temperature and density got infinite, then came a wild continuous expansion that was both homogeneous and isotropic in an extraordinarily hot and dense.'[2], are exemplaries too, of existence and the Presencing of Being. To explain (in like manner as previous): existence is rendered in the first line as the precondition of all that

follows-a singularity not merely as a physical point but as an ontological crucible in which all potentiality is compressed, unresolved, and undifferentiated. "Time and space are meaningless" is not simply a scientific abstraction but a philosophical recognition: in this nascent pre-existence, there are no coordinates, no distinctions, and no being-in-the-world as we understand it. It is not yet world. This is a state of pure pre-presence, where being has not yet begun to disclose itself-what might be termed the non-phenomenal origin of Totality. Then, as expansion begins-homogeneous, isotropic, and infinitely hot-the Presencing of Being bursts forth. The universe begins to differentiate, and with differentiation comes disclosure. Matter begins to form, fields begin to stretch, time begins to tick-being begins to be. This expansion is not just cosmological, but ontological: it is the aletheia of the universe, the unveiling of what was once hidden within the singularity. Thus, the Big Bang is not merely a scientific event, but a

metaphysical pivot: it is the first act of self-relation, the moment when the universe begins to observe itself, to structure itself, and thus to be present to itself.

And so comes the rest that we know of: the Universe is created and so with it, Totality and all of the beings within.

In this way, the Big Bang and Genesis speak the same truth - the Immaterial and the Material - albeit in different tongues: both offer a vision of an origin not from absence, but from concealed presence; not from nothingness, but from the silence before the Word, the stillness before the Unfolding. In both, existence does not arise passively, but asserts itself as a need-to be seen, to be known, to be shared in the open expanse of being-with. And in both, it is not enough that the world is; it must presence itself, must act as if it is, and must disclose its being through relations, through its being-there.

But the whole point of all of this here is the fact that existence exists because of its own property: it exists by itself, and there is

the Presencing of Being that holds itself to be formed as a principle without generalizing the being.

In the language of Maimonides, although he is more of a theologian in this context since the arguments I will present here are more of proving the existence of God, it can be said here that this applies to the concept of the Presencing of Being as charged: the arguments are also the first proof of this concept of the Presencing of Being, being (no pun intended) used to prove the existence of God.

II. Interpreting Maimonides' Fourth Precept

In the book by Samuel Nerenstein called *"The problem of the existence of God in Maimonides, Alanus and Averroes: a study in the religious philosophy of the twelfth century"*[3], which is a book detailing the proofs of the existence of God by the three major Abrahamic Religions (Christianity, Judaism, Islam) from one of the three well-known theologians of each religion.

Although made in 1924, the book – essentially an analytic comparison and compendium of their arguments – it is still an excellent book because it is richly detailed on how they try to prove the existence of the being-embodiment in the Immaterial and the axioms proofs they try to present within.

Now, on page 26 there is a section about the fourth precept of Maimonides, which quotes (in full text):

'The fourth proof of Maimonides reads as follows. We constantly see things passing from potentiality to actuality. An external agent is necessary to bring about this change. This agent was potential, when the thing was potential, and became actual in actualizing the thing. It was at first potential either because of some obstacle in the agent itself, or because of the absence of a certain relation between the agent and its effect. To remove this obstacle or to establish the required relation, another agent is necessary; the latter, in turn, needs an agent for itself, and so on ad infinitum. But this is impossible; we must therefore come to an agent which is constant, and in no sense

potential. The agent cannot be material but must be free from matter. "The immaterial being that includes no possibility whatever, but exists actually by its own essence is God. Since He is incorporeal, as has been demonstrated, it follows that He is One".[3:26]

This entire section was the first manifestation of such an argument for the Presencing of Being. How?

Let us thus break down this entire paragraph to see why this certain paragraph is a demonstration of the Presencing of Being in its state.

We begin our analysis with the first statement: '*We constantly see things passing from potentiality to actuality'*. This principle applies to all Totality; this clearly is the principle of Being that makes itself known. The potential state of Being becomes its actual state if the Being became its true state. This means that Being does not simply exist passively but unfolds itself through a transition that is driven by its inherent orientation toward actuality-a

movement from what it can be to what it must be.

Which leads us to the next sentence: *'An external agent is necessary to bring about this change'*. Let us demonstrate this sentence with a rock as our example. We can only know a rock exists if we discover that the rock acts like a rock (from potentiality) meaning, unless it has the qualities that makes a rock 'a rock', like throwing a rock at a wall that does not break itself immediately [otherwise it won't be a rock, such as cement bricks], then that is its actual state. Potentiality is a core essence of the Presencing of Being, for in the notion of potentiality lies the ontological anticipation of becoming-the silent readiness of the being to emerge into presence through the call of relation and manifestation.

On the notion of potentiality, the mechanism of Being to commit self-disclosure is demonstrated here as the inherent structure of ontological dynamism, where the being is always-already tending toward revealing itself in and through the

world. Thus the next sentence*: 'This agent was potential, when the thing was potential, and became actual in actualizing the thing.'* The Being discloses itself to make its actual presence in the world in its fullest form (the essence of Hyperposteriority), thus becoming the true essence of the thing's Being. *'It was at first potential either because of some obstacle in the agent itself,'* which states that the Presencing of Material being in the world that makes it an object of the Material World in and by itself. This means that the act of disclosure may be delayed or hindered by constraints that suppress the being's inherent movement toward actuality, yet this delay itself presupposes the being's intention to presence. Thus the next sentence: *'…or because of the absence of a certain relation between the agent and its effect.'* Which triggers the absence of presencing that triggers the notion of being. The Being here then commits an act that makes it seek its own actuality through the establishment of relation, for only in relation

can the Presencing of Being unfold into full intelligibility.

On the next sentence it states here: *'To remove this obstacle or to establish the required relation, another agent is necessary; the latter, in turn, needs an agent for itself, and so on ad infinitum.'* It needs, again, the presencing of being: such is the mechanism that operates all the wills of the being in the world of existence. Act as if it was willed by something - that is the principle in which it all operates by its nature. This reveals a structural dependence embedded within Being itself-a chain of disclosures that cannot self-sustain infinitely without collapsing into a groundless regress, thereby implying the necessity of a primordial Being that presences without needing to be presenced.

However, the sentence retorts: *'But this is impossible; we must therefore come to an agent which is constant, and in no sense potential. The agent cannot be 'material' but must be free from matter.'* The constant essence of presencing Being that governs the laws of actuality cannot be subject

to the laws of Material reality, therefore it is abstract; abstract is existential presencing but never a constant of Being present in reality. Therefore, this Being discloses itself (by way of worlding existential concerns of temporal governance) as a constant in the structure of the world and Totality. Therefore, this is by essence, God itself.

This way of proofing using the Presencing of Being follows the structure of a metaphysical necessity-tracing the cascading ontological movements of being to a terminus that presences without origin, wills without cause, and exists purely by essence. This way of world-disclosure by Maimonides demonstrates that God, as the unconditioned presencer, is the ground upon which all other beings find the capacity to disclose themselves in existence.

And therefore, the sentence concludes this as its proof for the existence of God according to Maimonides: *'The immaterial being that includes no possibility whatever, but exists actually by its own essence is God. Since He is*

incorporeal, as has been demonstrated, it follows that He is One.' And so, Maimonides then clearly means here that God is not merely the initiator of being but the very archetype of Being itself (that governs the Immaterial existence, which it is his domain and all Totality that is)- absolute actuality, pure presence, the foundational condition of all disclosure.

From here, we recognize the role of relationality: being is not a solitary act but a participatory one. Each being presences itself not in isolation but always-already within a field of others, within a Mitsein, a co-being, that is the true fabric of world. This is why, even in the sheer void of pre-creation, the "Spirit moves": because being demands encounter, and existence without relation is mute, frozen, a closed singularity. But the moment relation occurs-whether by divine gesture or thermodynamic expansion-world is born.

Thus, both the divine mythos and the scientific logos converge: being needs to be seen to be. Its presencing is not optional; it is

the very mode by which it insists on itself. The bag on the chair, the God in the darkness, the singularity expanding into stars-all are echoes of the same structure: a structure of unfolding, of becoming-visible, of acting-as-though-being.

And so we arrive at the imperative not only of existence but of attention: to be is to be encountered. The world is not given once, but is constantly being given, being revealed, being presenced. This is not only the truth of objects or of stars, but of us-Dasein-as well. We, too, must presence ourselves, must become what we are by acting as if we are.

That is not illusion, but essence.

This is the weight of our being: that we are called to presence. And this is the burden of our world: that it only exists because beings continue to say I am here.

And perhaps this, above all, is the root of care.

Chapter Two
Highest Good

I. Introduction to the Highest Good

The aim of all human existence is the attainment of the Highest Good, with our purpose to disclose the world (Hyperposteriority[1]). This idea, which aims to seek man to becoming it's being - the being of greater effect - as our cause of life, all morality and ethics, whichever may be, is aimed to the idea of the Highest Good. The more we do what is beneficial for this existence, the more we revere the lived life.

The Highest Good is, by itself, undefined: We may not know the real reason why we aim for it, but it can be understood. The Highest Good is the last of the last of the ideals of man that triumphs all there is. It is a goal, the greatest goal, the greatest end: it is a goal we all wanted to achieve, ever since we sprang forth from the

wombs of our mothers. It is only if we look in ourselves that we really know what to aim to achieve the Highest Good for all and ourselves.

Good is defined by itself as 'positive' along with all of its synonyms. But when it comes to the Highest Good, it is beyond itself; the 'good' has transcended itself to become even nobler than it can ever be. Good is Sein; the Highest Good is Dasein – the Highest Good is found in our role and will in the world we exist in. But this assumption is limited - it is the ultimate goal of metaphysics and philosophy: the Highest Good, as the pinnacle end of existence as a purpose, is the end of all fulfillment - the final fulfillment of a purposeful want in life, the end of all satisfaction, the end of the Other as a component of Being.

Thus the Highest Good can be said to be the final result of the Reverence for Life - where in the process of life that gives

itself its meaning, the Highest Good is said to be the result of

In individual units or in collective organs, all had the Highest Good in them as an ideal, for the Highest Good is a mechanism that morally keeps them from going on and pursue life as an active form of world-disclosure.

The Highest Good is practically a universal will, a universal moral goal that the people actively seek rendered unto life.

We act as if it was under us – for ever since the start of our lowly existence, it has become us: our source of life is under our will to keep living for the sake of fulfilling the Highest Good, the most beautiful of all things - for it is beauty not as appearance, but as necessity; not as adornment, but as being. The Highest Good compels not merely admiration, but action. It commands not just the eyes, but the soul. It is not what we look at, but what we live toward.

What people don't realize that all our worldviews are precisely trying to reach the Highest Good as the greatest fulfillment of our worldviews. A young girl wants to find a job: the want for a job is the Highest Good the young child sets as his concern for life. So she pursues education, learning important life-skills from her parents, growing herself up as she experiences existence – learn, live, embrace, grow… all the human experiences, she will think for it. But then she finishes education, she graduates from college, finds work from job fairs or other methods, applies from a job she wants, sometimes getting rejected, and once she found a job that accepts her, and the job does accept her in later life after searching for countless hours… she has said to earned the Highest Good in her life.

In this, the Highest Good is not a static perfection, nor a frozen virtue placed beyond reach. It is dynamic, breathing within the striving of each day, pulsing in the

moral tension of choice, rising through each gesture of kindness, sacrifice, and meaningful labor. And because of this, the Highest Good traps the person to strive higher and higher, until one achieve perfect existential bliss, the end of aletheia and the perfection of life as we know it.

It is the poetic end of a life worth living.

This is why we say the Highest Good is not merely a philosophical abstraction, but a demand, a tension that haunts existence with the need to be more than mere survival. The Highest Good is the protest against nihilism. It is the metaphysical 'no' to despair, and the eternal 'yes' to meaningful being. In its name we build, we think, we endure - for it wills us to make a world that deserves to exist.

It wants us to appreciate the world as we experience existence. It wants us to continue living for it: we live to seek and achieve the Highest Good in all of us.

And yet, the world as it is often obscures it. The Highest Good does not scream through noise; it murmurs through stillness. It does not declare itself through power, but through authenticity. It can be forgotten, betrayed, sold - but it cannot be destroyed. It hides in silence until it is reawakened by a conscience refusing to die, by a gaze that dares to see beyond convenience, by a will that refuses to kneel to absurdity.

To pursue the Highest Good is to live forward - into risk, into unknowing, into transcendence. It is to refuse the seduction of completion and instead walk toward completion as a calling. One does not reach the Highest Good as one reaches a destination; one enacts it, embodies it, until one's life becomes its echo.

Thus we are all pilgrims of a divine unknown - a horizon that reveals itself only in movement. For the Highest Good is not behind us, not around us, not even above us

- it becomes through us. It is the world disclosed by those who live with reverence, and die without regret.

II. Everything is the Highest Good

The Highest Good is not just limited to Humanity. It is an aspect of existence; the domains and beings of the Immaterial (Abstract), Material (Physical), and Hypermaterial (Unknown and Both) all have the Highest Good in them. Religion (Immaterial), Science (Material), and Philosophy (Hypermaterial) respectively all have the essences of the Highest Good in us.

The Highest Good operates on the principle that all shall remain in the harmony of their becoming - that every existence, in its own way, fulfills its part in the cosmic unfolding toward meaningfulness. Albert Schweitzer, in his book *Civilization and Ethics*[2], expresses such principles: 'For in

world- and in life-affirmation and in ethics I carry out the will of the universal will-to-live which reveals itself in me.'[2:xvii] This is one such aspect that all shall not overlook, partly because the things all live for ultimately echo the cry of being to be more - to fulfill itself beyond mere subsistence.

Because of this, the Highest Good is taken to be the logical extreme, a total evolution of the Reverence for Life as put forward by Albert Schweitzer.

We therefore state here then that the entire existence we live in is precisely moving towards the Highest Good - not merely as a future to be achieved, but as a destiny already inscribed into the structure of reality itself. This movement is not random, nor is it arbitrary: it is the eternal surge of Being toward fuller expression, a divine impulse echoing through the veins of time, space, and consciousness. Everything participates in this motion - the falling of rain upon dry soil, the flowering of a single

idea in a sleepless mind, the trembling hand that reaches out in love or in sacrifice. All these are moments of the world bending toward the Good, participating in the divine script of fulfillment. Albert Schweitzer thus reminds us on the same book: 'If the ethic of self-devotion, therefore, is to agree with the ethic of self-perfection, it too must become universal, and let its devotion be directed not only towards man and society but somehow or other towards all life whatever in the world.'[2:228]

Our devotion, then, must be aligned with perfection: a perfected devotion to the Good, perhaps. This is the true universal imperative of all that exists – that we strive to do the Good for everyone at its greatest.

And because everything bends toward it, the Highest Good is not isolated within the human heart alone - it pulses through the stars, dances through atoms, breathes within silence. Every system, every creature, every whisper of presence

contributes to its becoming. Even chaos, even suffering, even contradiction - they too, strangely, mysteriously, are not outside the scope of the Highest Good. For from chaos, order may be re-forged; from suffering, depth; from contradiction, the birth of synthesis. Thus, the cosmos is not a theater of meaningless drift, but a crucible of becoming - and the Highest Good is the fire that gives it shape.

And if this is so, then it follows that the Highest Good is not a possession, but a path. One does not own it - one walks it. It is not an artifact to be admired; it is a becoming that calls us into constant transformation. To live for the Highest Good is to live beyond the self, and yet most deeply within the self. It is to say "yes" to the burden of consciousness, the tension of choice, the weight of meaning. It is to become the shepherd of existence, knowing that even the smallest act echoes through eternity.

God, the Atom, and Sein (Being). In them lies the Highest Good that sought all. Even they aim for the Highest Good – God - not as a tyrant of fate, but as the eternal witness of meaning; the Atom - not as mere particle, but as the whisper of cosmic intention; and Sein - Being itself, which cradles all and points beyond itself toward that which justifies existence. In these, the Highest Good does not merely appear - it manifests, it becomes the very grammar of reality. For God wills the Good as divine expression; the Atom becomes the Good in motion; and Sein carries the Good as the mystery of presence. The Highest Good is thus not a simple end, but the unifying thread through which all things find purpose. And through this, we are reminded: not only that we are part of the Good, but that the Good is endlessly becoming through us.

Therefore, to truly live without reverence, to act without awareness, is to

resist the very rhythm of the cosmos. It is to fall out of tune with the melody of being, and in doing so, to experience not just guilt - but fragmentation. For the Highest Good, once glimpsed, demands fidelity. It does not punish - it simply withdraws, and the soul is left to wander a world that no longer shines. This is the true fall: not from grace, but from purpose.

But the Highest Good is mercy as much as demand. It awaits return. It awaits awakening. It is patient as the mountains, fierce as the fire, silent as the stars. To realign with it is to be reborn, not in the eyes of others, but in the depths of one's own becoming. And such a rebirth is not rare - it happens every time one chooses truth over convenience, love over power, and being over appearance.

Thus the Highest Good is not far. It is not hidden. It is not some divine relic buried in time or myth. It is here - in this

breath, in this choice, in this trembling will to mean something.

We move toward it because we are it, in potential. And in choosing it, again and again, we make the world new.

Thus, everyone in Totality has the embodiment of the Highest Good as its will. What is life without it?

The answer: there is nothing. And impossible.

III. The Existential Essence of Life

In the religious worldview of the Zimbabwean civilization, there is exists an Immaterial being – a God – named Mwari. Mwari, in their worldview, is not just a God that operates existence, but also interpreted as a God of Manifestations. "Mwari is the infinite power and is thus capable of anything.

He is lightning, falling stars, the rain, the drought, the cold of winter, and the

searing heat of summer. He is day and night and the huge vastness of the granite monoliths. He not only manifests himself in spectacular demonstrations of power, he is power."[3:54] Thus, Mwari is the center of the religion of the Zimbabwean civilization: and the religion is still present in the modern Zimbabwean civilization today.

Now, in their religion there is a divine record (myth) regarding Karuva: the son of Dzivaguru, a semi-divine ancestral figure who, after being betrayed by his brother, leads his wives and cattle into the sacred pool of Nyamakati, symbolically choosing transcendence over submission. The entire myth, in its full text form[3:136-137] (numeration is by the author of this book), is as follows:

'Dzivaguru represents the original Sikarudzi or Musikavanhu – creator of the nation and of the people [(1:1)]. Karuva represents the Adam figure; his first son [(1:2)]. The invading Korekore under the

mythical God-son Mutota found the descendants of Karuva already living in the country they now wished to settle (1:3). The nearest Korekore nyika to Choma is that of Nyombwe to the south west above the escarpment (1:4). This is the chiefdom (ushe) of Dotito which was founded by Nyabapa Nyanehwe who was married to a Mutota-figure daughter and who adopted his wife's mutupo (1:5). Nyanehwe is given credit for the conquest of Karuva (N.B. - Dzivaguru) (1:6). Several attempts to defeat Karuva met with failure because Karuva evoked his magic to hide himself and his people in thick, wet mists (1:7). It was only after his brother Chirumbi, divulged the secret of the magic to Nyabapa that he was able to attack Karuva without the latter being able to take evasive action (1:8).

In disgust at his betrayal and imminent defeat Karuva, rather than fall into the hands of the invader, led all his wives, and all his the pool of Nyamakati (1:9). Karuva and his people live in a watery heaven with Dzivaguru, beneath the surface of the pool, where his herds graze on lush pastures

and all is perfect (1:10). On clear nights when the moon is full one can hear them singing as they dance to their drums (1:11). They even emerge from the pool, but should you disturb them by coming too close, they instantly submerge (1:12).'

The mythology regarding Karuva, Dzivaguru's son, demonstrate here the principle of a symbolic act of existential resistance and transcendence. Rather than surrender to conquest and betrayal (1:9), Karuva leads his wives and herds into the sacred pool of Nyamakati, where he is said to live in a "watery heaven" with lush pastures and song (1:10). This story illustrates an act of fidelity to Being, a refusal to be corrupted or diminished - and in doing so, he chooses a form of ideal, transcendent existence.

The Highest Good in this case is our will to purpose, which is the main essence of the Highest Good. In the myth, Karuva's drive for apotheosis lies with the

desire from permanence in the world as a goal, to eternal renewal by as the goal: permanence in the world was Karuva's Highest Good before (1:7), but with that permanence broken and unsustainable because there is a force that wants to break that Highest Good (1:3), threatening non-existence (1:8). This forces Karuva to redefine his Highest Good, and therefore he had to transform into a new will for the good that will define him far beyond in his current state: this being the idea freeing one's constraints-not by preserving the self in stasis, but by embracing the embodiment of the divine, a power that one can control its own death and rebirth as the truest expression of freedom, where identity is no longer bound by what was, but continually redefined by the will to become. Thus the Highest Good of Karuva is to become divinely heroic and renewed in a new state of being, one sublimed and presenced in the world. Thus, he saved his people (1:9) and

made a new Immaterial embodiment (1:10) under the auspices of Mwari's control of the Immaterial World and its worldview.

Now, the point of this section here makes us clarify that the essence of life is its purpose: the purpose of life is to fulfil the Highest Good. It can take many manifestations and may also take many dimensions, and even can reset itself accordingly, with or without intervention from the being. The Highest Good is the mover of life that makes existence worth living, for all have the want to fulfil the Highest Good! It is the mode where concern shows itself in the world, the concern for being that animates every gesture, every choice, and every refusal to surrender to meaninglessness. The concern for being is not just anxiety or care-it is the primal orientation of existence toward its own fulfilment. In every life that seeks one wants and one has in the world, in every voice that dares to speak truth in the silence

of indifference against the nihilistic world of non-meaning, the Highest Good is being enacted.

This concern – this drive toward meaningfulness inherent in the world to be harnessed by all beings – is at the heartbeat of the cosmos itself. The purpose of life, then, is not given from without but rises from within: from the trembling recognition that to exist is to be tasked with becoming. Becoming is existing. And in that becoming, through the many modes one can achieve to reach it – be it love, courage, sacrifice, or surrender, or anything there is to achieve forth – the Highest Good reveals its essence: not a thing to possess, but a direction to will as embodiment, one that resounds in the great apotheosis of all that exists in the world.

Now: what made Man, truly Man?

It is because of its perseverance to live forth and in that perseverance, to summon meaning from finitude. What

made Man, truly Man, is not the tools he forged or the civilization-societies he built, but the sacred refusal to remain mere chunks of matter with as soul and intellectual awareness: the sacred will to stretch toward the unseen, the unprovable, and the unspeakably beautiful as its greatest end – once we have seen the unseen, prove the unprovable, and speak the unspeakably beautiful – there we have met ourselves the highest purpose of our achievements.

It is this greatest pilgrimage we have to undertake - this ceaseless reaching for the Highest Good even amidst ruin and doubt - that renders Man in its true form. Not by nature, but by striving. Not by inheritance, but by choice: the choice to live fulfillingly. For to be human is to become more than what one is - and in that becoming, to carry oneself within one's soul. Thus, the Highest Good is not merely what we aim for, but what makes the aim possible. It is not only our end - it is our essence.

And in that essence, we are not simply beings in the world - we are the world, disclosed.

The existential essence of life is in our will to strive forward in life – and that is what the Highest Good wants in us, for each and everyone in existence.

Chapter Three

Problem of Universals

Let's start this discussion something with an exemplary predicament of ours, shall we?

Let us say you are walking towards a cafe, and you see your long-lost friend [for this experiment let us assume and/or pretend that you are a boy and your (best)friend is a girl] who has not seen you in years. You greet, and order a drink together - pretty normal interactions. Then you and your friend start to talk and chat together on whatever topic one passes by, but usually, for this scenario, you ask something about your life after, say, high school or retirement from work. So after some time, she pulls out a mirror in the bag to check on her face and do a little makeup. But then, she asks this question while still

looking at the mirror: "Am I pretty?" Normally, a response will be, in normal conversation, be a response that is something playful: that being, "You are pretty." But the thing is, she is holding a mirror to check on her face, but still manages to ask that question irreverently.

But that is not all.

The question implies there is no free will in the introspection of being - for the question alone is problematic: it assumes the universality of being as a form. No matter what you respond to it, the answer had become universalized in the sense that it attempts to generalize Dasein as a principle of self-disclosure of concern. Even if your response (especially if your friend is, let say in this scenario, a frenemy or an enemy) will be "You are ugly", the response already has been universalized by its nature, and therefore there is no free will on the articles of being.

This makes it weird in essence.

At this point, the appropriate response should be: "Look at the mirror. Are you pretty or not?", and let her existentially answer the question, for it will force her to introspect the being of the question. This makes her alienate being from existence, which will trigger a response that leads to her seeking answers to complete the universalization (i.e. "No, I want you to answer: am I pretty or not?"), or, if she backs down, she will begin to confront the void of her own self-image, where the lack of external validation reveals the absence of internal certainty-an ontological discomfort that unsettles the very grounds of her question.

This is what I call this little dilemma of ours, the 'problem of universals'. What is the problem of universals? This problem is what characterizes the absolute state of being that leads us towards alienation from Dasein: the generalization of being as a categorical imperative of existence. In page

169 of *Being and Time*, Martin Heidegger once asked this question: 'But what more is there to point out in Being-in-the-world, beyond the essential relations of Being alongside the world (concern), Being-with (solicitude), and Being-one's-Self ('who')?'[1:169] The question, which aids us in our discourse, tells us that to point out the thing as being, it needs to have a relational presence in the world-that is, a situatedness within care, interaction, and understanding that discloses its being as already interpreted through the prism of existence-in-context.

Whenever the question of being comes up in everyday life, we often tend to generalize the nature of disclosure to be projected and given upon us, provided that the conditions and the state of Being generally exist in the presencing of being in the world. The mode and state of being (provided that, again, it is present in the world, thus it acts as such) has been trapped in its own act of being that forces itself to

endlessly self-question its own labyrinth that causes its very alienation that consumed its own existence. Thus, the question of generalization leads not to understanding but to estrangement-it transforms inquiry into an echo chamber where being speaks only in terms of its abstraction, not its actuality.

In the question of generalization of being, it will only reach that state when, in the course of no free will, the world is saturated around the question of being. The being loses merit when it transforms from a base normative to a universalized generality: it's a mode of existence that restricts itself to oblivion, through alienation, wherein the force of external expectation overrides authentic presence, turning the subject into an object of conceptual representation rather than a lived experiential reality.

Therefore, the generalization of Being – which precisely makes it lose its characteristics – is a concern for us.

Thus, the object of being is sidelined as an identity without its own rather than an object that has merit in itself.

When the being itself is saturated to the point it has no merit of meaning anymore, then there will be a deadlock in the concept that forces itself to develop. The word in the world of being becomes meaningless, and it has been stripped of all notions of immediacy—it becomes language without referent, a symbol who's signified has been hollowed out by incessant repetition.

In that void, Being becomes a performance rather than a phenomenon: it is no longer a question of "who am I?" but rather "what am I expected to be?" The individual, then, does not exist as such, but only as seen—as interpreted, labeled, and recycled through the expectations that surround her. And what is worse, this deadlock breeds a recursive anxiety; the question of being now folds upon itself, not

as a spiral of discovery, but as a vortex of disintegration.

And this disintegration is caused by the assumed universality of value-meaning inherent within the concept already held in the first place. The value-meaning begins to unfold as a mere casket of emptiness in it.

This is where the absurdity of the situation lies—in that moment of seemingly trivial conversation, in the harmless café setting, the question "Am I pretty?" becomes a site of existential crisis. For it is not beauty that is truly being asked, but rather the worth of being seen—the silent, desperate desire for one's existence to matter not in itself but to another. And in that longing, the self then forfeits itself. The mirror becomes a portal, not to reflection, but to collapse—a still surface that reveals nothing but the question itself, repeated endlessly in different forms: "Am I enough? Am I there? Do I exist when I am not affirmed?"

What then is the mode of value in order to solve the problem? Value is given here in the presencing of uniqueness – the answers already lie upon existence in order to bring forward the true, unsaturated meaning of Being inherent in the common language of an experience in existence. Sartre once remarked in his book, *Being and Nothingness*, this: 'Everything happens as if my selfness confronting that of the Other were produced and maintained by a totality which would push its own nihilation to the extreme; being-for-others appears to be the prolongation of the pure reflective scissiparity.'[2:299] The abolition of universality in the common presence of existence is not a descent into chaos, but rather a reclamation of authenticity. When value is returned to the realm of the particular—when being is no longer filtered through the generalized lens of what ought to be but is allowed to appear as what is—then and only then does Dasein begin to reassert itself.

The mirror ceases to be a device of judgment and becomes instead a threshold: a passage through which the subject may traverse from alienation to presence. In such a moment, the self begins to stand again—not as an answer, not even as a question, but as a presence-in-becoming.

Only this can mankind stop and proceed itself to be free from the regimentation of existence that acts lifeless and assumes that all have the same substance that degrades the status and quality of society in the first place. We must then, and only then, abolish uncertainty in society and bring back our true confidence in our being. The question, "Am I pretty?" is not the problem – the approach, is the problem.

Is it as if there is no worth and dignity in the reality of the question within; that is why give them the mirror and let them answer the question themselves so that one can return to true morality.

True happiness should not be based on value, but on worth – existential worth. This worth is worth a million times in gold: worth is far superior to value, for value is derived, while worth is lived. Value is a measure imposed—by culture, by expectation, by another's gaze—while worth is an affirmation of being as it is, untethered from the machinery of exchange and judgment. When the subject recognizes their own worth, the gaze of the other loses its tyranny; the mirror no longer reflects a question, but simply an image—an image unburdened by the need to be justified.

And so, to reclaim our Being, we must stop asking questions that already presuppose the answer. We must stop performing ourselves into palatable constructs for the comfort of others' perceptions. We must instead begin to live—not through value-affirming feedback loops, but through the radical acceptance of the self as presence.

Not because it conforms, but because it is.

For the liberation of Dasein does not lie in the affirmation of a fixed identity, but in the unfolding of presence as a continuous, undetermined becoming. To be is not to be pretty. To be is not even to be good. To be is, simply, to stand there—without apology, without mask, without need for affirmation. And in that standing, one finds not approval, but freedom.

It is here where the "problem of universals" collapses—not in confrontation, but in irrelevance. The universal becomes weightless when the particular is enough. And in that moment, when the mirror is put down, and the question dissolves into silence, we return—finally—to the only thing that ever mattered: the presence of Being itself.

In this manner, the problem of universals is no longer merely a metaphysical quandary—it is a daily

phenomenon, a real existential epidemic wherein we, stripped of rooted being, replace ontological truth with aesthetic certainty, existential merit with social affirmation. We ask others to define us because we have forgotten how to be alone with the question. And in doing so, we lose the only freedom we truly have: the ability to stand before the void and say, "I am," without asking for applause.

Chapter Four

Three Modes of Politics

I. Introduction

In the sphere of politics, we can observe here that there exists three modes in which politics will exist in society. These three modes dictate the culture of the civilization, which in turn, will shape the worldview and outlook of what that society is. These 'modes' we speak of are what constitute the basic political organism of the people, and what such a mode would look like under the structure of power. The three modes of politics are:

1) Politics of Personalities
2) Politics of Ideologies
3) Politics of Civilizations

The three modes can manifest at any form given in the formation of societies

(which, in turn, can manifest at the level of civilizations). Such modes are present in all civilization-societies in the past, present, and in the future - so long as there is the presence of human experience in existence; so long as there is humanity, these modes of politics will exist and shall exist at the level of its own Presencing of Being. They may take different forms, sure, but these are their essences: essences common as archetypes of power and the political structure that dictates the laws of its governance.

We can go so far that we can consider these three modes to be the Spirit of the Culture. The Spirit of the Culture is an aspect of the Civilization-Society (and thus this concept is called by other names: 'Spirit of the Civilization, Spirit of Society', and 'Spirit of the Civilization-Society') where its featured, most noticeable aspect becomes its total embodiment. The Spirit of the Culture is what characterizes the care and concern for the essence of identity

present in the civilization-society; these are features of society that dictate the common actions of people as a single unified organism that acts as a social leverage-bond that allows culture to flourish and co-exist with other pillars of civilization.

An example of this is the Finnish cultural idea of the Sisu: unyielding determination, perseverance, and stoic resolve in the face of adversity[1]. Sisu is not merely an abstract trait; it is the Spirit of the Finnish Culture that permeates its politics, its governance, and its societal structure. In Finland's political life, especially during moments of national crisis or transformation, we see the Politics of Civilizations taking precedence-where the decisions made are not merely ideological or personality-driven, but rather reflect the deeper cultural ethos of endurance and unity. This manifestation of Sisu exemplifies how the Spirit of the Culture becomes a lived reality, shaping the mode through

which politics is practiced and experienced. It is through such cultural spirits that a civilization-society asserts its unique mode of being-in-the-world, establishing a framework through which political action is not just executed but embodied-revealing how these three political modes are not simply mechanical categories, but dynamic expressions of a people's historical, existential, and civilizational identity.

But the point here is it can be considered to be the Spirit of the Culture as a legal embodiment of the Three Modes of Politics. Personally, I believe that it cannot be such a case, for politics and culture are separate spheres of society that dictates the total worldview of a civilization-society; I leave it to other researchers and other philosophers who will take this notion in the discourse of political anthropology, civilizational sociology, or metaphysical jurisprudence-fields that attempt to analyze the relationship between structure and

meaning, between logos and mythos, in the formation of societal governance.

Going back to the Three Modes of Politics, what characterizes the politics of a people is also what characterizes the mode of power. Each type of mode applicable to the civilization-society tells us what kinds of power can distribute and structure accordingly to its being. The modes themselves commit aletheia in the presence of power - it is 'being-there' that will take form the presence of structure within the society due to the selected mode of political organization. Once the mode has taken its form, and finally fully formed in the disclosure of power, then it begins its flow: the flow of integration across society and into the worldview of the civilization that gives its distinct characteristics.

Form, Structure, and Flow: these are symbolic process of integration of ideas as integral into the worldview of civilization-societies. All three are necessary if we want

to integrate these modes into our political structure so that it can happen. No system of government will have these prerequisites of processes that transform themselves into an organ of power, which is embodied as politics. Politics here, I refer to, as the process in which it is an instrument of organization that provides social cohesion as a unified organism; the bringing-forth of governance as human instrumentality - that is our given definition of what politics is, essentially.

However, all of these is politics - when you are governed, prepare to manifest power in various forms. Even in anarchist civilizations such as the Makhnovschina fit our definition of politics: it is an instrument of organization that provides social cohesion, the bringing-forth of governance as human instrumentality - in this case, a form of decentralized, horizontal politics rooted in communal autonomy and anti-authoritarian ethical values. Despite its

rejection of state structures, the Makhnovschina still operated on modes of power organization that fulfilled the prerequisites of governance, even if under the banner of anti-governance.

Therefore, we argue then that the Three Modes of Politics is, in fact, existing; it has, as a fundamental organ of the political existence of civilization-societies, always existed and forever will exist - Sein in Dasein, for it is by principle, a major disclosure on how to manage masses of people. No civilization-society in history has the absence of these three, for a society that does not adhere to any of these three modes does not exist - a permanent Tabula Rasa of civilization-society does not exist and no civilization-society will exist because even the most primal or future civilizations require a framework of power, be it personified, idealized, or civilizational-power must always manifest, and manifestation necessitates a mode!

II. Politics of Personalities

The first manifestation of such a mode is the Politics of Personalities. This is the first manifestation of such a political system in human history. Even in the societies of the Neanderthals, our closest human ancestors of the genus Homo, use this mode of politics.

In the Politics of Personalities, the man is the center of all political activity. Man is a political object of being, the focus of our political culture. Everything revolves around the human in power; patriarchal and matriarchal societies before the rise of the Neolithic are of this nature. Whoever leads, shall lead the people; this man is fetishized as the logos of all power, the source of everything, and the basis for all organization, and therefore the political culture is man-centric. Whatever the man does with his ideas he will do and dictate the

society at will. The people are born to serve the man, and the man is born to serve the people, simple as.

Supposed I belong to such a society. When I enter the sociopolitical sphere, I will use myself as a vehicle for politics: my personality - say, I am caring, I am intelligent, et cetera - will dictate the worldview of the civilization-society. When I rule, I rule as myself integrated into the existence of society: Sein subjects itself to Dasein. I am the civilization-society's form of world-disclosure, I will be the one who will rule all over my fellow people. It is in me, my personality, that will give such a system to be founded on, and all of our political systems will be based on the ruling figure. Therefore, our political culture is based on the personality of the person.

The only legitimate source of power is in the individual and its personality.

Since the emergence of Gobelki Tepe, all civilization-societies in the world

are of this form, or has originated from this form of power. The Quechan and their civilization-society for example had leaders called paʔipá taʔaxán (real man)[2]. Their leaders are regarded as one of the wisest men - or, the most ethically charged to lead - in their civilization-society. One of the traits that he has to have is articulation of speech, for the paʔipá taʔaxán has to address the concerns of the people, thus also giving them news and offering a few well-chosen words of encouragement for the coming day's activities. The result? The Quechans wanted their leader to be essentially three things: kind, generous to the poor, and always willing to put the interests of the people above his own. Therefore, their political culture is centered on the leader – thus the Politics of Personality – as the basis of all political organization in Quechan Civilization-Society.

III. Politics of Ideologies

The second manifestation of the mode of politics is the Politics of Ideologies. This is the second manifestation of such a political system in human history. The first civilization-society to do such a system is ancient Persia under the Achaemenid Empire, where Zoroastrian cosmology served as the ideological foundation for the legitimacy of kingship and imperial governance-a model where divine order (asha) became the sacred political contract binding ruler and subject.

In the Politics of Ideologies, the source of all worldview is within the ideas contained in it. The idea is the logos of government, a sacred political entity that binds the people to follow its contract so that it may exist and commits its presencing in the world. Its ideas are the source of power; all must abide to the great idea that shapes the political system of a civilization-society. The idea is the source of everything and is the master of everything in the rules

of power; therefore, the idea is political. The people, then, are binded by contract to serve the idea, and the idea must uphold its social contract to serve the people.

Supposed I belonged to such a society. When I enter the sociopolitical sphere, the totality of my political being would be judged not by who I am but by what I believe in, and how well I can embody, defend, and propagate the ideological principles that give coherence to the state. I become a vessel of the idea, and my political legitimacy stems from my fidelity to its essence. The human becomes the idea and embodies all its aspects as a mechanism of power and politics, for belief fuels the foundation of political power and ideas by the structure of its essence present in the state.

The only legitimate source of power is in the idea and its collective projection of its contract so that the idea can manifest itself in the world.

The politics of ideology rose at a time where, instead of persons, the ideas became the form of government as a model for society. This is due to the presence of a growing intellectual class within civilization-societies that offers (through world-disclosure) new forms of government. They thought and said to themselves, "instead of a person as a center of our politics, why not we center it on our ideas as the basis of our politics?" So came the early theoreticians of our civilization-societies across the globe, thanks to our early political philosophers who are trying to make their ideas from the realm of the abstract (the Immaterial; theory) into reality (the Material; practice).

The example of Peronist Argentina illustrates our predicament[4]: Juan Peron wants to establish a state based on the Peronist ideal, so Juan Perón sought to establish a state based on the Peronist ideal, so he institutionalized a political vision grounded in Justicialismo-a synthesis of

social justice, economic independence, and political sovereignty. The Peronist state was not legitimized through Perón's personal charisma alone, but through its ideological promise to harmonize the interests of labor, capital, and the nation. Through policies like the nationalization of key industries and the promotion of workers' rights, Peronism positioned itself as a totalizing worldview-a lived ideology that redefined the Argentine social order. The people were not merely subjects of a ruler, but adherents to a vision, expected to internalize and enact its tenets in everyday life. Even Perón himself became secondary to the mythos of Peronism; the movement outlived the man, transforming into a self-perpetuating ideological organism. In this way, Argentina under Perón exemplifies how the Politics of Ideologies can embed itself so deeply into the fabric of society that it becomes indistinguishable from the political order itself.

IV. Politics of Civilizations

The third and final manifestation of a mode of politics is the Politics of Civilizations. This is the highest, most supreme, and a more sophisticated form of politics in human history. It is the highest form of politics in which it serves no equal to all others.

In the Politics of Civilizations, the being and its existence is at the center of all political activity. All the aggregates that makes a civilization, a civilization, becomes the center of all political power. The Three Pillars of Existence - Immaterial, Material, and Hypermaterial - are at the center of all power because by recognizing these pillars of existence, one can form a new worldview of politics based on their world-disclosure. It is always a process of bringing-forth the nature of existence in Totality, which cause us to have different interpretations of

Totality. Because of these, they shape our entire worldview and structure, including the Six Pillars of Civilization: Politics and Economy, Religion, Culture, Language, History and Philosophy. It therefore became integral to us that our civilization is at the center of all political structure and therefore our political culture - and man must abide to the beloningness of the civilization through care and concern for it. The civilization-society becomes its political logos. The people exist to belong to a community and serve it, and the community must serve the people in symbiosis with the people.

Supposed I belong to such a society. When I enter the sociopolitical sphere, the primordial belongingness to my civilizational identity precedes all other identities-I do not exist apart from my civilization, and my political agency is exercised as a guardian of its essence, continuity, and destiny. My actions are

judged by how they preserve or enhance the integrity of our civilizational being.

The only legitimate source of power is in the essence and adherence of its civilization-society.

The politics of civilizations are what constitutes the world order as societies move beyond the person and the idea: the politics of civilizations are at the apex of human creativity. It is the reason why civilizations cannot be grouped as cultures or on ethnic lines (such as in Huntington's[5] model or in Koneczeny's model[6]), for there are civilizations that have developed independently in themselves without interference from other civilizations: Hungary, for example, isn't by essence Western Civilization simply because it has absorbed the Sein of the West, but is actually is own separate civilization-society from the rest of all Europe. And Hungary, if we look at its history[7], did not manifest as a single, eternal, and permanent Dasein in itself:

Hungary has went through successive waves of existential transformations-from a nomadic, Turanic root, to Christian Latinization, to Ottoman Islamic contact, to Austro-Hungarian imperial synthesis, to Soviet occupation, and now, a distinct nationalist reassertion of its own unique civilizational trajectory. Each phase layered a new structure onto its cultural body, forming an integrated yet singular Dasein that is neither wholly Eastern nor Western but something sui generis.

V. Conclusion

To understand the three modes better, we have to look up at a macroscopic level - this time, in a simple comparison of two administrations - the Viktor Yanukovych administration and the Petro Poroshenko administration - of Ukraine[8] as a staging point for our simple and conclusive summary to understand the

concepts better. For the Politics of Personality, we look at the individual and its personality: in this case, Viktor Yanukovych and Petro Poroshenko.

For the Politics of Ideology, we look at its ideals: in this case, Bagong Center-right and Center-left, respectively. And for the Politics of Civilizations, we look at its adherence to a civilization-society: Petro Poroshenko embodies Western (Huntington, Koneczeny) or American (Rovero) values, while Viktor Yanukovych embodies Orthodox (Huntington) or Byzantine (Koneczeny) or Russian (Rovero) values.

These are what characterizes the Three Modes of Politics in practical essence.

These Three Modes are integral to our understanding of politics as inherent in society, for they clearly make us define the mechanisms of function when it comes to the nature of power when it comes to the nature of power as it exists in relation to

Being. Power is never just an external force-an exoskeletal structure imposed upon an otherwise passive people. Rather, power is immanent in the people, as the people, and it discloses itself through the form it assumes: whether through the charismatic weight of a personality, the binding abstraction of an idea, or the civilizational gravity of a people's historical memory.

In this way, the Three Modes of Politics are not mere taxonomical classifications. They are modes of worlding. Each is a form of Entwurf-a projection of being-into-the-world-that determines the structure of society's relationship to the political. Each mode is a horizon of intelligibility that configures how governance is perceived, legitimized, and enacted. This is what makes these modes universal and transhistorical: not because every society contains them in equal proportion, but because every society must-at some level-orient itself toward one or

more of these as the locus of its organizing principle.

If they are combined, a new form of political analysis can be derived from this model of political structuring of civilization-societies. Let us therefore restate, as clearly as we can:

1) The Politics of Personality prioritizes the who-*it is the ontology of leadership;*
2) The Politics of Ideology prioritizes the what-*it is the epistemology of governance;*
3) The Politics of Civilizations prioritizes the wherefrom and wheretoward-*it is the teleology of existence.*

Each of these bears within itself a logic of time. Personality is presentist, for it focuses on the immediate, the affective, and the embodied now. Ideology is futurist, for it aims at utopia, at the not-yet. Civilization is atemporal, for it sees itself as a long-duration project, with a metaphysical past

and an eschatological telos. A civilization-society that lives according to the Politics of Civilizations is one that is aware of its own destine being, its mission, its uniqueness as an expression of human potentiality.

And yet, in practice, no society exists as a pure embodiment of any one mode. All three intersect, converge, and conflict. The Politics of Personality may animate the face of a revolutionary leader, even as they proclaim ideological slogans, within a civilization that has millennia of continuity behind it. The Politics of Ideology may reconfigure the political landscape, even as it is championed by charismatic individuals or rooted in civilizational consciousness. The Politics of Civilizations may silently inform the structure of national myths, rituals, and public memory, even when masked by liberal institutions or populist politics.

This is why the Three Modes of Politics is necessary.

Why? So we can identify which civilization-societies use the mode of politics in order to identify governance structures that made them essentially unique, and which civilization-society has that mode as the center of all political worldview. We will categorize civilization-societies on the basis of these three modes as the foundation for political science and political philosophy on the basis of civilization-societies.

Thus, it is not merely in the identification of these modes that we advance our political understanding, but in the recognition of how they interweave, how they form the dynamic triad of political being. A society moves, evolves, and contorts itself through the dominance of one, the retreat of another, or the hybridization of all three. Their presence is not symmetrical, but dialectical. They contest each other-and through that contestation, society discloses its truth.

We conclude, then, with this:

The Three Modes of Politics are not simply tools to categorize the past or predict the future. They are phenomenological truths, grounded in the fundamental structures of human existence. Where there is society, there is governance; where there is governance, there is politics; and where there is politics, these modes shall be. For as long as there is Being-in-the-world, there shall be form, there shall be structure, and there shall be flow-threefold, eternal, and irreducible.

Such is the order of the Political Cosmos.

Chapter Five

Reverence for Death

I. The Spectacle of Death

The well-known feeling of death is a phenomenon amongst mankind wherein the psyche of the negative responds to events that threaten the life of a being – usually, death. This is mostly (and usually) manifested in the common human reaction of dread: one cannot help but feel the presence of death. In situations where fight or flight responses are at breaking point (therefore unable to respond to either fight or flight), this is the result of such a situation. The feeling begins to transcend, from primal fear to existential fear. This fear becomes its own drive to exist as if one is trapped in a dilemma to either accept existence or non-existence. This drive forces man to arrest itself accordingly and be straight up overwhelmed.

In near-death situations, it presences itself as a total halt in consciousness and then emanates fear from the process of halting consciousness. Of all things in life, death is a certain possibility that may indeed happen, and our fear of death comes itself around as its very response. But this is no mere fear of death: this is a response against death - the sudden realization of the absolute inevitability of its great cessation that it begins to unfold itself the ways it can manifest. One is existential trauma. Existential trauma is different from medical trauma - both in the context of physical and emotional traumas in the Material World (the domain of Science). If we apply the concept of trauma in a Hypermaterialistic context (which is the domain of Philosophy), then it will take a new meaning: trauma is now defined here as an existential shock against the elements of reality, so sudden it causes the mind to splinter into a kaleidoscope of disoriented

awareness, leaving one suspended between the fragile illusion of life and the vast, unyielding void of nothingness.

It makes the person unable to face the presence of mortality as a fact of life: the man will end up entering an existential crisis that would spiral into a relentless questioning of meaning, purpose, and selfhood, where every attempt to reclaim coherence is shattered by the haunting awareness that all things-love, identity, and thought itself-are ultimately contingent upon the very thing they most dread: their end.

The end is what we all fear, and we always think it might happen to us.

A person watching a horror movie in this scenario will feel dread, sensing that it might happen to him someday-a fictional death on screen becomes a mirror, not of the monster or ghost, but of his own inevitable demise, triggering a quiet panic that what is being seen is not just spectacle,

but a symbolic rehearsal of his future non-being. A person watching the news about a war somewhere too far away (in the other side of the world) will start to be overwhelmingly concerned about the possibility of dying-even though the violence is distant, the imagery breaches the boundary of safety, planting the seed of dread that such a fate is not confined to others but is a universal threat, drawing him into an anxious identification with suffering and death as if it were already knocking at his own door.

This eternal fear of death is what made mankind revere it and fear it at the same time, but also seek to tame it through rituals, stories, and systems of belief that promise continuity beyond the grave. Religion, philosophy, and even modern science have each attempted in their own way to soften death's finality, offering illusions of control or transcendence. Yet beneath these constructions lies a persistent

terror-that no matter how much meaning we assign, the void remains unmoved, patiently awaiting it's due.

In fact, we are brought to a new concept once we realized that death becomes a permanent existential concern and facet of humanity in itself once it begins to experience life.

This concept is the Reverence for Death.

II. The Reverence for Death

Mankind's inability to face death becomes an obsession within: it becomes hysteric about it. But if we start to sublime ourselves with the world and realize death is just as integral as life is, for we will always realize that nothing is ever permanent in this world, we should not just accept this but actually face this head on. Even in immortality, the flesh withers, for the universe itself moves toward entropy, decay,

and silence. To live forever would not be to escape death, but to prolong its shadow, watching everything else pass into oblivion while one remains to remember. Thus, true reverence for death is not the denial of its presence, but the courage to acknowledge its necessity as the silent architect of meaning, shaping the contours of life through its inevitable end.

But if we start to achieve something beyond the mere domains of immortality and life extension, one that allows us to move beyond the great and limiting confines of our physical and real being, then we begin to touch upon a transcendence that is no longer eternally bound by the binary of life and death. This is no longer a quest for survival, but for the march towards a great transformation: a metamorphosis of consciousness that redefines what it means to exist. In this state, death is no longer the end, but a threshold into an unknown

continuity where meaning is not inherited from life, but discovered anew beyond it.

Death will still be present, but there is only the death of the limited self, the ego that once clung to permanence and identity. What emerges beyond is not immortality in the traditional sense, but a liberation from the fear that once defined existence. In shedding this fear, man becomes something else entirely: not a being that defies death, but one that dances with it, at peace with the rhythm of becoming and unbecoming.

And that is the true essence of the Reverence for Death.

In an article by NBC in America, on May 2023, 23-year-old Jordan Rivera from Englewood, Florida, lost his right arm in an alligator attack after falling into a pond behind Banditos Bar in Port Charlotte[3,1]. Rivera had stepped outside to relieve himself due to long bathroom lines and either tripped or the ground gave way, leading him into the water where a 10-foot

alligator bit off his arm. He was rescued by bystanders and transported to a trauma center. Despite the severity of his injuries, Rivera remained optimistic, stating, "I didn't lose my life, I lost an arm. It's not the end of the world." The alligator was later captured and euthanized by wildlife officials, following standard protocol[1].

This attitude towards death absolves the primal fear of the end of life and becomes life itself: the sacrifice of a part for the preservation of the whole, the relinquishing of something once essential in order to embrace what still remains. Rivera's response exemplifies a profound shift in awareness—where the confrontation with mortality doesn't paralyze, but liberates; where the brush with death does not diminish the will to live but deepens it, transforming the loss into a testament of survival, resilience, and meaning. In this light, Reverence for Death is not merely about solemn awe or philosophical

contemplation—it becomes a truly lived principle, an existential grace that allows one to walk beside death without succumbing to its shadow, to suffer and yet affirm, to lose and yet continue, to face the abyss and whisper, "I am still here."

Unlike the Reverence for Life, the Reverence for Death is not a celebration of vitality or the pursuit of flourishing, but an acknowledgment of finitude as sacred, a devotion to the transient and the impermanent as the very canvas upon which meaning is etched. It does not seek to preserve life at all costs, but to honor the cycles of becoming and passing away, to find dignity in decay and purpose in perishing. Where the Reverence for Life clings to breath and blood, the Reverence for Death finds sanctity in stillness, in letting go, in returning to the void with grace. It is the courage to see the end not as an enemy but as a culmination—a sacred silence that completes the symphony of being.

III. Existential Dread

One brings forth into the world by itself accordingly, there will be a natural sense of questioning regarding his or her whole existence in the world. Such pretenses leads to natural curiosity, but even this noble examinations of the world can swing the pendulum from positive coexistence to negative dread against the nature of the world. In the arc of nonbeing may lie, too, a semblance of curiosity; but the faculties of man seems to restrict itself to being rather than nonbeing. This situation leads not to calm, but to madness – a great hysteria so befallen towards the curse of mankind, so great that it became the center of our focus often; even some, made it the center of their worldviews. This dread has now befallen mankind of its awareness of the world, one that became its greatest consummation.

This dread of existence causes the realms of fear and its negative manifestations to become singular in unity. This is what made mankind experience the numerous existential crises – so many cases! – to become its defining feature of a response to the possibility of consciousness. This prima facie of a self that confronts not only the burden of living but also the unbearable lightness of ceasing to be, becomes the kernel of existential anxiety. Man, once aware of the fragility of the world and his own place within it, collapses inward upon the realization that meaning is not embedded in the world, but must be invented under the shadow of impermanence. In this shadow, dread is not just an emotion—it is a constant companion. In one of Heidegger's *Black Notebooks*, especially in line 33 of Ponderings XII, he says this: 'There are some who never come to die their own death; others die their own death often.'[2] This is a presence that

comes to us accordingly when death becomes a seen-presence of Being as a living absence, a breath that moves through our moments like wind through an empty hall. To die one's own death often is to encounter, again and again, the inevitability of non-being in the midst of life itself—to become intimate with disappearance as if it were a lover, whispering through the cracks of our daily selves. Each awareness of death becomes a mirror: one does not merely live, but dies again and again in the act of meaning-making.

We face death, not as humans, but as the world coming to terms that the end is just the beginning.

This recurring death is not just symbolic; it is transformative. It is the death of naïve assurance, of presumed immortality, of the comfort that life can go on indefinitely unexamined. The man who dies his death often is not defeated but awakened—shaken into the realization that

each moment of dread is also a moment of potential, a rupture through which the authentic self may finally step forward. For in the trembling before the abyss, the self finds itself unmasked, undone, but not unworthy.

Beata Halassy, a virologist at the University of Zagreb, undertook a remarkable self-experimentation by treating her recurrent breast cancer using lab-grown viruses—a method known as oncolytic virotherapy (OVT)[4]. In 2020, after her cancer returned post-mastectomy and chemotherapy, she administered two viruses—the measles virus and vesicular stomatitis virus—directly into her tumor over two months[5,4, 6]. This approach led to significant tumor shrinkage and an immune response, facilitating surgical removal without serious side effects[4]. While Halassy reported a positive experience and no recurrence post-treatment, experts caution against self-treatment due to ethical

concerns and potential risks, emphasizing that such methods should not replace established medical protocols[7].

In her case, when we dread the possibility of death, we should recognize that it is also something to be worth for: the threat of existential dread, while very concerning, becomes the optimistic imperative in which dread, although it consumes you to the point of no return, becomes the period in which we strive to break our own limit and face the abyss. This mindset, where the body is sacrificed so that the spirit of death marches itself against death accordingly. This paradox, although thought to be impossible, is a testament to the strange logic of human courage—that in fearing death, we may come to embody life more fully than ever before. For dread, in its highest form, does not paralyze but provokes; it forces the self into revolt, into creation, into a desperate transcendence. Thus, the paradox resolves itself: we do not

escape death by denying it, but by passing through its shadow, eyes open, heart fierce, becoming more than what we were before.

The soul enters a period of a dangerous revolt against existence and death in which it brings forward – as in the case of Beata Halassy – a revolt against the world of limitations, a fiery revolution a revolt against the world of limitations, a fiery revolution that defies the boundary between the mortal and the transcendent. This rebellion is not born of nihilism, but of a sacred refusal to be constrained by finitude, a drive to reforge the meaning of life in the furnace of dread. It is in this crucible that the self discovers its truest potential—not to conquer death, but to become worthy of it. "Everything that comes to life thereby already begins to die as well, to go toward its death, and death is also life." – This is what Martin Heidegger in page 146 of *Introduction to Metaphysics*[8] illustrates to us that death is not merely a cessation, but a revealing—an unveiling of

the truth that all things come into being only to pass away.

In this movement toward death, life discloses its essence: a finite unfolding always on the edge of disappearing.

Shall we fear then, the idea of Existential Dread?

Our answer, after all this discussion, is my only response to it: there is no madness, only a fragile equilibrium—delicate, trembling, yet unbroken—between the terror of non-being and the unyielding will to create meaning in spite of it.

It is the mind's last beautiful stand, shaping silence into survival, naming the void so it does not consume us. And thus, the entire metaphysical meaning of the Reverence of Death lies within this answer accordingly.

IV. Conclusion

The Reverence for Death is precisely, the epitome of man's adornment

for the possibility of death as the cessation of being, not death as in its original essence, but death as the end of being – the end, not so much to be dealt with, but to embrace it, for there is always the end of all active life there is. Being may or may not last forever, but the being itself may end in ways unbeknownst to us. So does existence, which too, may or may not last forever, but it can but it can yield to the quiet calling of its opposite, dissolving like a fading echo in the cave of time. The final surrender is not one of defeat, but of return—an end that, in its silence, completes the story of what it meant to be. And in this reverence, we find that the embrace of death is the final gesture of love toward the life we once held.

This is the wisdom death grants us: not fear, not resignation, but the urgency to live fully, deeply, and presently. The Reverence for Death is not a morbid fixation, but a sacred orientation—a compass pointing us toward authenticity.

For only when we acknowledge the end can we begin anew; only when we accept the impermanence of things can we value them in their fleeting beauty. The end, then, is not the closing of a chapter, but the ink with which it is written. And in knowing this, we do not despair—we bow our heads not to nothingness, but to the great silence from which all things arise, and to which all things return.

Chapter Six

Heideggerian Mathematics and Proving that 10 is a Solitary Number

I. Prolegomena to Heideggerian Mathematics

Only philosophers can solve unsolved problems in mathematics, for Math is subjected to the whims of Philosophy precisely because Math deals with both the abstract and the physical.

But to do this one needs a system of mathematics that integrates philosophy and mathematics in order to solve unsolved problems. Numbers, as we are all accustomed to, are precisely representatives of physical properties for the purpose of defining objects (or beings) in the world, and thus they penetrate and embody the fabric of reality. We can say that the average human body has 35,000,000,000,000 (or 35 trillion) cells[1] because these are precisely lodged into the fabric of existence that holds

us together. If this wasn't true, then our body should be in chaos right now: chaos, like fluctuating the number - and the body too must be a chaotic mass of flesh instead if it were to happen. Numbers are like codes in a computer: they are precisely structural mappings of intelligibility, binding together material reality and mental abstraction. They are not merely labels, but essential architectures that the world of beings discloses through calculation and order. Without numbers, Being's disclosure of the world would fracture into chaotic unintelligibility.

Numbers in the physical world is one thing, but what if numbers become abstract entities themselves? Separate the numbers from the objects?

This system of math will deal with this questions, as you are about to find out how these fit into our new system of mathematics. Numbers here are abstract entities but also pervading both worlds,

precisely making them 'governors' of the structure of the world. The numbers become themselves, presence as themselves, became themselves; they are no longer bound by the laws of the Immaterial and the Material world.

This is the entire premise of Heideggerian Mathematics.

II. Introduction to Heideggerian Mathematics

The entire basis for this new mathematical system rests itself on a fundamental axiomatic equation. The equation goes like this:

$$Being(D) = f(T(D), W(D))$$

The components of this axiom are:

- Let D represent Dasein (the being that questions its own being);

- Let $W(D)$ be the world as disclosed by Dasein; and
- Let $T(D)$ be the temporality structuring Dasein's experience (past = thrownness, present = fallenness, future = projection); and
- The structure of meaning is not static.

This axiom, which has become a basis for the entire structure of Heideggerian Mathematics to prove itself profound in the act of revealing how mathematical meaning unfolds through existential structures rather than from purely formal logical axioms.

However, this presences us another thing about this formula: assuming that Being is structured within existence, we can notate the fact that Being acts like a constant in the fabric of existence (Dasein and Sein).

Thus, assume Being is structured within existence, and acts like a constant in the fabric of existence. Therefore, prove to us then that

$$f = Being(D) = \int T(D)W(D)$$

and solve this axiom.

Now, the integral-like notation suggests Being is a functional over Dasein's temporal and world-disclosing structures. [This means that Being integrates over the temporal experiences of Dasein to produce the unfolding of meaning.

We are thus given this:

$$f = \int T(D)W(D)$$

This seems to clearly demonstrate that the function of Being is an "integration" (a synthesis or unfolding) from temporality to world-disclosure.

Thus, Being(D) is not just a static value but a process:

$$Being(D) = f\big(T(D), W(D)\big)$$
$$= \int T(D)W(D)\ d(meaning)$$

Which, after reframing the entire notation, gives us two great insights:

- Temporality T(D) conditions Dasein's openness;
- World W(D) unfolds as a result of this openness; and
- The Being of Dasein is the resultant meaning arising through this projection.

Now that we have reframed the notation itself we can begin to solve the axiom.

Let us realize this then, two things before we proceed. These two important things are:

- The "constant" nature of Being is not that it's unchanging, but that it grounds all change; and
- Dasein's Being is revealed through its temporal projection into a world.

Thus, we get this equation:

$$Being(D) = \int T(D)W(D)\, d(disclosure)$$

Which gives us the true result of a phenomenological synthesis in the world: the disclosure of Being is the "sum" of Dasein's temporal thrown-projection as it opens a world.

Therefore, the axiom solves as:

$$\text{Being(D)} = \text{f(T(D), W(D))}$$
$$= \int (Temporal\ Horizon)$$
$$\rightarrow (World\ Disclosure)$$

Or in words:

Being(D) is the integral (or unfolding) of Dasein's temporal structure projected into its world — a dynamic synthesis where meaning arises.

This aligns with Heidegger's claim that Being is time, and Dasein is the clearing where Being becomes intelligible.

III. Proving the basic Mathematic set: 1+1=2

The test of all mathematical systems and theories lies in the idea of proof: proof here as the manifestation of ontological disclosure rather than mere logical formalism.

This anchors mathematical operations in the existential movement of Dasein, not in detached logical constructs.

Each operation reflects a deeper structure of Being.

Let us suppose ourselves that math is founded in this basic structure. To prove that 1 is a number, we're not just stating a formal axiom, but disclosing the being of "1" as it emerges from Dasein's existential-ontological structure.

Let us recall that

- D: Dasein, the being for whom Being is an issue.
- $T(D)$: Temporality (past = thrownness, future = projection, present = fallenness)
- $W(D)$: World-disclosure

And the formula accordingly:

$$Being(D) = f(T(D), W(D))$$

Now, in Heideggerian Mathematics that numbers are not entities in themselves,

but meaning-structures projected by Dasein in its world. This mean that a number is a disclosed unity—a horizon of intelligibility—emerging from Dasein's temporally-structured engagement with beings.

So we do not "define" 1—we uncover it as a primordial mode of counting-as-being.

The ontological question is therefore disclosed to us this: *how does '1' come to presence in our world?*

There are three modes that the presencing of being for the quantity known as '1' will bring itself to being. These three modes are:

- *Thrownness:* Dasein finds itself always already amidst beings.
- *Projection:* Dasein projects structures of intelligibility onto these beings.

- *Fallenness:* Dasein engages with beings in everydayness, using calculative thinking.

In this context, the unity of "1" arises as:

The first disclosed horizon of differentiation.

Meaning that 1 is not "the first thing" but the first countable disclosable.

Thus, accordingly it presences to us as:

$$1 = \textit{the disclosed minimal unity of difference}$$

Which is only possible because Dasein projects unity as intelligibility onto beings.

Based on this model, it clearly seems to us that this is how the number operates itself in the world.

Therefore, a number (n) is defined as:

$$n = \delta_n = a\ temporally\ disclosed\ structure\ of\ multiplicity - as - unity\ in\ the\ world$$

And therefore, 1 is regarded as:

$$1 = \delta_1 = the\ first\ possible\ projection\ of\ unity\ upon\ a\ being$$

But the question remains here: how do we prove that 1 is a number?

This is how we prove that one is a number:

- Let Dasein encounter a world $W(D)$, and let it disclose beings as "something."
- In order to disclose something at all, Dasein must minimally differentiate "this" from "not-this." This is the primordial act of counting.

- The first act of counting is the projection of unity onto something.
- This projection is only possible within the temporality $T(D)$, as Dasein stretches between past and future to unify the present.
- Therefore, 1 is not presupposed—it is disclosed as the first formalization of unity in Being.

Hence, we prove that:

$$1 = f(T(D), W(D)) = Being(D)|_{\delta_1}$$

And thus 1 is a number, which already regards itself as a disclosed structure within Heideggerian Mathematics.

So then we move from the disclosure of unity to the disclosure of relationality between unities. In Heideggerian Mathematics, 1 + 1 isn't just an operation—it is, clearly presented in itself

as a disclosure of a temporal-ontological synthesis where Dasein brings two unities into meaningful relation.

We already disclosed here that $1 = \delta_1 =$ the first horizon of unity projected by Dasein.

Now, when we consider 1+1, we must ask ourselves: *How does Dasein project multiplicity while preserving unity?* This presents us that this is a movement of meaning—a temporal unfolding, in which the structure of Dasein gathers its thrownness and projection into an intelligible synthesis, uniting difference without dissolving identity.

So we regard that this results in the presencing of the Temporal Synthesis as a structure of mathematical operation. The Temporal Synthesis goes like this: Past + Future = Present.

There are three things that we can process here:

- The first 1 is a thrown unity—Dasein already finds something disclosed.
- The second 1 is projected—Dasein anticipates another disclosure.
- The "+" is the horizon of synthesis: Dasein gathers these two disclosures together in the present, revealing a new totality of meaning.

Therefore:

$$1 + 1 = \delta_2 = \textit{the minimal disclosed multiplicity grounded in unity}$$

So, with this in mind, how do we formalize this structure? The result will be:

- Dasein discloses δ_1 : unity of a being.

- Then it repeats the act of projection, disclosing a second unity.
- Through this repetition, it experiences the difference within sameness: unity is not destroyed but transcended.

This movement and mathematical disclosure gives us a new formula structure to present us a new way of expressing mathematical structures of operation. This will result in as

$$\delta_1 \oplus \delta_1 = \delta_2$$

Where $\oplus$ is not just arithmetical "+" but ontological gathering, the act of unifying within difference. Thus, the result will be δ_2 being the new disclosed multiplicity: "2."

The meaning of this results to us that "2" is not a static label. It is the first

appearance of a relational structure—a world where more than one unity coheres meaningfully.

Therefore

$$2 = \delta_2 = the\ disclosed\ being\ of\ difference - in - unity$$

Therefore, how do we prove that 1+1=2 is, in fact, a legitimate formula for mathematics that accurate represents the ideation of numbers?

This is how we will solve the proof:

- Dasein projects unity onto a being: δ_1.
- Dasein re-projects and differentiates a second being: another δ_1.
- Through temporal synthesis (rooted in$T(D)$), Dasein gathers these into a disclosed multiplicity.

- This gathering gives rise to a new structure of Being: δ_2, i.e., "2"

But note: this 2 is not a Platonic form, nor a formal object—it is a disclosed possibility of Being, emergent from Dasein's movement in time and world. Thus, it expresses itself as:

$$1 + 1 = \delta_2 = 2$$

Or, in Heideggerian Mathematics, it is more accurately depicted as

$$\delta_1 \oplus \delta_1 = \delta_2$$

IV. The Mathematical Structure of Heideggerian Mathematics

So how do we characterize this form of mathematics? In this section comes are foundational concepts not only for Heideggerian Mathematics, but for the ontology of mathematics as such. However,

we shall stick here for now the elements of Heideggerian Mathematics.

The first thing to know is that here, we treat these not as objects in a pre-existing ontological space, but as disclosed structures of meaning, made intelligible through Dasein's temporal projection. This meant that numbers, sets, groups, and points are not given independently; they arise only as Dasein opens a world through time and projection. They are not empirical entities nor purely formal constructs, but relational modes of disclosure.

First, we start with numbers.

As we have already developed this concept during the process of proving 1+1=2, a number here is not a mere formal object, but a temporally disclosed unity-in-difference.

Hence

$$n = \delta_n = f(T(D), W(D))$$

And thus, numbers are temporal unities—they emerge through Dasein's projection of identity and difference in time. Thus, numbers are the rhythm of disclosed sameness and difference in the temporal flow of Being.

In the conception of numbers, we must recognize three natures that characterize the nature of numbers themselves, which is crucial for our understanding of Heidiggerian Math:

- δ_1: First unity.
- δ_n: Repeated, gathered unities.
- Each number is a disclosed quantitative totality, but with qualitative modes that can additionally presence itself to characterize the world (e.g., odd, even, prime).

Now, then to the concept of sets. What are sets?

Sets are worlded horizons of togetherness—not containers of pre-existing elements, but intentional groupings disclosed as meaningful unities. Thus, a set is not a pile—it is a projected totality: "these belong together."

Therefore, In Heideggerian terms: a clearing in which multiple beings are seen as related.

Thus, a set is a disclosed region of meaning—precisely, a mode of gathering difference.

Now, in algebra, there is a concept known as Groups, which is the fundamental concepts that lies all of algebra. Groups consist of a set equipped with a binary operation that satisfies four key properties: specifically, it includes property of closure, associativity, the existence of an identity element, and the existence of inverse elements[4] – this is its definition in classical mathematics. Now, how does Hediggerian Mathematics view the presence of Groups?

Groups (in the algebraic sense essentially) are ontological structures of symmetry. It is defined by operations that preserve identity, inversion, and closure.

But in Heideggerian terms, a group is a reversible, rule-governed mode of transformation—how Dasein anticipates return and invariance.

Therefore, a group is a temporal play of sameness-in-transformation—Being that returns to itself under operation.

And lastly, we are down to the last important concept, one that characterizes the entire field of geometry. This concept is a Point, where is a location represented by a dot[2]. A point does not have any length, width, shape or size, it only has a position[2, 3]. When two distinct points are connected they form a line.

Points are the liminal unities of spatial disclosure. The point is not a location "out there," but a minimal spatial

disclosure—a node of world-possibility. It is the vanishing horizon of extension, the "where" of potential spatial orientation.

Therefore, a Point is not a thing; it is how space begins to be for Dasein so that it may take form.

So, what are they, essentially? They are structures of disclosed meaning—not things, but ontological modes that emerge in any formal projection of a world.

To summarize these concepts, we provided a table in the next page to summarize them accordingly.

With all these concepts now forming the basis for Heideggerian Mathematics in its basic form, we then ask ourselves a question:

Are these Real Objects or Necessary Relationships?

Mathematical Concept	*What it* is	*Ontological Status*
Number	Disclosed temporal unity	Necessary horizon of disclosure
Set	Intentional gathering	Regional worldhood
Group	Structure of reversible transformations	Formal rhythm of sameness
Point	Liminal spatial unity	Edge of spatial disclosure

This question allows us to reflect on the ontological status of mathematical concepts in Heideggerian Mathematics. Mathematical entities are not discovered like continents, nor invented like tools; rather, they are disclosed through the structures of Being itself. They are ontological artifacts of Dasein's encounter with worldhood. This means that mathematics is neither purely subjective nor purely objective—it is a domain of necessary relations grounded in the clearing of Being. When Being discloses, mathematical structure necessarily follows, like a shadow accompanying the unfolding of world.

So, how does Heideggerian Mathematics approach this question?

In Heideggerian Mathematics, none of these are "real" in the ontic way—like chairs or planets. Numbers, sets, groups, etc. do not exist independently of disclosure, and they are not things-in-themselves, because they are not natural

objects in the Material World, nor purely abstract in the Immaterial World – instead, it has the properties of both.

Thus, they are not present-at-hand (Vorhanden) but rather ready-to-be-thought (Zuhanden-sein)—tools of intelligibility, an actual characteristic of the Hypermaterial World, which is the domain of Philosophy itself.

But however: Though they're not ontic objects, they necessarily arise when any being is disclosed as structured. That is, they are existential a priori of formal worlds. They are there to govern and structure all of reality that exists therein, whether it's an abstract concept or a physical object.

So, with this in mind:

- Numbers are how quantity shows up.
- Sets are how togetherness shows up.

- Groups are how transformation and identity show up.
- Points are how space shows up.

This is how Hediggerian Mathematics structures itself accordingly. They are structural invariants of disclosure, not "floating abstractions." Thus they exist necessarily within any system of totality, because they are ways being becomes intelligible – for they are structures of operations to disclose the world, and a disclosed world itself.

So does that mean Math is basically subordinate to the Hypermaterial World? Yes. Why? Because it is not abstract as in the Immaterial World, and it is not physical as in the Material World, for both are subsumed under the realm of disclosed meaning that lies between the merely abstract and the merely material.

So, are these real objects? No, they are not real objects, but they necessarily

exist as relationships that all intelligible structures (and thus all mathematics) must exhibit.

V. The Concepts of a Friendly Number and a Solitary Number

Before we put to the test this new system of Mathematics, we must first explain the concept of the Friendly Number, then we will proceed to explain the Solitary Number, which lies the greatest question that remains unsolved until this day. In fact, this remains one of the most well-known unanswered problems in Mathematics, in which we aim to solve here accordingly.

And since these are two concepts that are reliant to each other, we will first introduce the concept of the Friendly Number, as structured.

A Friendly Number (in classical mathematics) are two or more numbers if

they share the same "abundancy ratio," which is defined as:

$$abundancy\ of\ n\ =\ \frac{\sigma(n)}{n}$$

Where $\sigma(n)$ is thus the sum of all positive divisors of n, including n itself. So, the examples of the numbers 6 and 28 are demonstrated here respectively:

$$\sigma(6) = 1 + 2 + 3 + 6$$
$$= 12 \rightarrow 12 \div 6 = 2$$

And

$$\sigma(28) = 1 + 2 + 4 + 7 + 14 + 28$$
$$= 56 \rightarrow 56 \div 28 = 2$$

Thus, 6 and 28 are friendly—they "resonate" with the same structural rhythm.

However, in the realm of Heideggerian Mathematics, these are a pair

of friendly numbers is like a dyad of Dasein-beings who, while ontologically distinct, share the same horizon of world-disclosure. Their Being-in-the-world has a shared ontological tempo. They are not identical, but they "belong together" in the same clearing of Being.

In Heideggerian Mathematics this is expressed as a formula:

$$\delta_{\mathrm{a}} \sim \delta_b \Leftrightarrow \frac{\sigma(\delta_{\mathrm{a}})}{\delta_{\mathrm{a}}} = \frac{\sigma(\delta_b)}{\delta_b}$$

This expresses an ontological friendship: numbers whose self-disclosure structures the world with the same relational ratio.

Thus they “co-disclose” existence in analogous forms.

Now, let us proceed ourselves to the concept of Solitary Numbers. What is a Solitary Number?

In classical mathematics, a number is solitary if it does not share its abundancy ratio with any other number. For example, 1 is a solitary number because

$$\sigma(1) = 1 \rightarrow abundancy = 1 \div 1 = 1$$

And there is no other positive integer has an abundancy ratio of exactly 1; therefore it is a solitary number.

In Heideggerian Mathematics a solitary number is like an ontologically isolated being—a mode of Dasein whose projection of world does not resonate with any other. It is not incomplete; rather, it is its own mode of disclosure, with no symmetrical peer. This is the numerical counterpart of Being-toward-itself without shared gathering.

Solitary numbers are like thrown beings whose structure cannot be mirrored in another—an ontological solipsism of

sorts. They stand apart not in deficiency, but in irreducibility of resonance.

With these definitions, let us go forward to an unsolved problem in Mathematics, and this problem is questioned like this:

Is 10 a solitary number?

VI. 'Is 10 a Solitary Number?' (Part one): The background of an unsolved problem, and its attempts to solve it

The question of whether 10 is a solitary number remains an unsolved problem in mathematics. A number is classified as solitary if it does not share its abundancy (the ratio of the sum of its divisors to itself) with any other positive integer. For a number to be conclusively proven solitary, a common method is to show that it is coprime with its sum of divisors — but in the case of 10, this approach fails, and no alternative proof has

yet been found. As such, while many mathematicians believe that 10 is solitary, a formal proof continues to elude researchers.

This uncertainty highlights the broader difficulty in classifying numbers as solitary or friendly (non-solitary). Several other small integers — such as 14, 15, 20, and 22 — are similarly believed to be solitary based on computational evidence and theoretical reasoning, but lack a rigorous proof. The technical challenge stems from the properties of divisibility and number-theoretic functions, where standard tools like gcd calculations do not resolve the question for these numbers. Consequently, solitary numbers inhabit an intriguing niche in number theory, blending simple definitions with profound complexity.

Understanding whether 10 is solitary has wider implications for the study of numerical relationships and divisor functions. Solving this problem could potentially lead to new methods in analytic

number theory and deepen our understanding of number classification based on divisor properties. As of now, it remains a small yet captivating puzzle in mathematics — an example of how even seemingly simple questions about small integers can resist answers for decades.

VII. 'Is 10 a Solitary Number?' (Part two): Our solution to the problem

We now turn to the solution for this unanswered question accordingly. How does Heideggerian Mathematics solve the problem?

First, let us see how classical mathematics tries to solve the problem.

Remember, a number n is said to be solitary if no other positive integer $m \neq n$ shares the same abundancy ratio:

$$abundancy(n) = \frac{\sigma(n)}{n}$$

Where σ(n) is the sum of all positive divisors, including n.

So for 10:

$$\sigma(10) = 1 + 2 + 5 + 10 = 18$$
$$abundancy(10) = \frac{18}{10} = \frac{9}{5} = 1.8$$

Now, is there any other integer m ≠ 10 such that $\frac{\sigma(m)}{m} = \frac{9}{5}$?

As of current knowledge: It is unknown. No other such number m ≠ 10 is known. Therefore, 10 is currently classified as a solitary number—not because we have a proof, but because no friendly partner has been discovered.

It is one of those "questionable" or "suspected" solitary numbers.

Now let us see here and demonstrate here how Heidiggerian Math solves the problem.

In Heideggerian Mathematics, solitude is not a lack—it is a mode of ontological standing-apart. A solitary number is a unity whose disclosure of Being is singular and unreciprocated. It is like Dasein whose projection of worldhood resists mirroring—it belongs to itself and not to a communal ontological rhythm.

So how does δ_{10} (the being-structure of 10) show up?

We write:

$$\sigma(\delta 10) = \delta 1 \oplus \delta 2 \oplus \delta 5 \oplus \delta 10 = \delta 18$$

$$\Longrightarrow abundancy\ ratio = \frac{\delta_{18}}{\delta_{10}} = \frac{9}{5}$$

This means: the world that discloses δ_{10} is proportionally 1.8 times richer than

δ_{10} itself. But so far, no other disclosed unity shares that exact existential ratio.

Ontologically then, it is by essence:

- δ_{10} is a thrown unity grounded in $\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_5$.
- It has a closed world horizon.
- Its temporal rhythm (9:5) is unshared.

It is thus:

- Not perfect (its world does not gather exactly into itself)
- Not abundant (world > being, but not vastly so)
- Not friendly (no co-worlding disclosed)
- Not yet relational (no known echo)

Conclusion: δ_{10} is an ontological monad—resonant in itself, but not yet

encountered by a reflective echo in the disclosed number-field.

Therefore, the final and actual answer is

$$10 \in Solitary$$

In Heideggerian Mathematics, 10 is an "ontologically silent" number: a being whose mode of worldhood is unresolved—projected, gathered, but not reciprocated.

It is now clearly demonstrated here that it is existentially situated as solitary.

VIII. Further expositions on the Solitude of 10

It is in this attempt at us solving this problem that we can demonstrate the self-unfolding of Being as an event: the operation of Ereignis as integral in the unfolding of the mathematical process. Let us demonstrate here then, how 10 did

indeed became a solitary number because of the principle of Ereignis.

Ereignis here is defined as the event that reveals its own presence.

To be clear as well, this is also the convergence of Heideggerian Mathematics as a system in four fronts:

- Our symbolic construction of number (e.g., δ_n = disclosed being-unity)
- The abundancy formula ($\frac{\sigma(n)}{n}$)
- The concept of solitary vs. friendly
- And now: Ereignis—Being's self-unfolding as event as integral to the world-disclosure of the mathematical process.

First, let us clarify the ontological structure of 10 as a Solitary number.

We write:

$$\sigma(\delta 10) = \delta_1 \oplus \delta_2 \oplus \delta_5 \oplus \delta_{10} = \delta_{18}$$

Therefore:

$$\delta 10\ projects\ a\ world - structure\ whose\ total\ gathering\ is\ \delta 18.$$

$$abundancy\ ratio\colon \frac{18}{10} = \frac{9}{5}$$

Now, consider our general formulation:

$$\delta_n\ is\ perfect \Leftrightarrow \sigma(\delta_n) - \delta_n = \delta_n \rightarrow world = being$$

$$\delta_n \; is \; friendly \; \Leftrightarrow \quad \frac{\sigma(\delta_n)}{\delta_n}$$
$$= \frac{\sigma(\delta_m)}{\delta_m} \; for \; some \; m$$
$$\neq \; n$$
$$\rightarrow \quad shared \; structure$$

$$\delta n \; is \; solitary \; \Leftrightarrow \quad \frac{\sigma(\delta_n)}{\delta_n}$$
$$\notin \frac{\sigma(\delta_m)}{\delta_m} for \; all \; m \; \neq \; n$$
$$\rightarrow \quad unshared \; disclosure$$

10 appears to belong to the third category—solitary.

Now, Heidegger in Introduction to Metaphysics[6] (and later in Being and Time) describes the Ereignis as the event in which Being and its disclosure come into co-belonging. It is the "enowning" of Being: the way in which Being gives itself to Dasein.

If we bring this into our numerical framework:

$$Ereignis(\delta_n) = \textit{ the moment when } \delta_n\textit{'s projection into a world discloses itself as a total structure of belonging}$$

Now, if δ_n is perfect: the Ereignis is closed and self-grounded.

If δ_n is friendly: the Ereignis is shared, echoed—a resonant clearing.

But if δ_n is solitary: the Ereignis is silent. It happens once, unreciprocated. It clears a space—but no other being walks through that space.

Since it has been proved that 10 is a Solitary number, the last one is true by its own presencing of being.

So therefore,

$$Ereignis(\delta_{10}) = \delta_{10} \rightarrow \delta_{18}$$

$$with\ no\ \delta_m\ such\ that\ \delta_m \rightarrow \delta\left(\frac{18m}{10}\right) = \delta_{18}$$

This means:

- δ_{10} opens a world.
- The world returns a ratio (9:5).
- But no other number joins δ_{10} in that existential ratio, thus *it is proven that it is by nature, a solitary number.*

We now interpret that $Ereignis(\delta_{10}) =$ the event where δ_{10}'s disclosure of world fails to find any ontological kinship. It is a projection into a clearing with no echo.

It is not inauthentic—on the contrary, δ_{10} fully discloses its world ($\sigma = 18$). But the world it opens is one that no other disclosed being has entered.

It is the mathematical analog of what Heidegger calls "Being held out into

the nothing" which is a characteristic of Dasein[5].

In symbolic terms,

$$\delta_{10} \longrightarrow \delta_{18}$$

But

$$\neg\exists\, \delta_m \neq \delta 10 : \frac{\sigma(\delta_m)}{\delta_m} = \frac{9}{5}$$

So the Ereignis of δ_{10} is a clearing-without-companion.

Therefore, we also propose here a symbolic formulation of Ereignis:

$$Ereignis(\delta_n) = \delta_n \longrightarrow \sigma(\delta_n) = \delta_w$$

Which demonstrates how it reveals itself to make it disclosed.

Now, based on this formulation, it can be concluded accordingly that

If $\exists\, m \neq n$ such that $\frac{\sigma(\delta m)}{\delta m} = \frac{\sigma(\delta n)}{\delta n} \rightarrow Ereignis(\delta_n)$ is echoed (shared world) ⇒ Friendly.

But, if no such m exists then $\rightarrow Ereignis(\delta n)$ is solitary ⇒ Solitary.

Thus,

$$Ereignis(\delta_n) = unreciprocated\ event\ of\ projection: a\ world\ opened, no\ co-disclosure$$

And since 10 is a Solitary Number, it is clear that its Ereignis is solitary in its own nature of disclosure.

Now, another feature that Heideggerian Mathematics that can demonstrate and integrate into its mathematical worldview is that it can mathematically demonstrate the presence of anxiety, authenticity, and the silence of conscience – in mathematical terms. To

demonstrate this, let us then base this on a premise to conduct such a mathematical operation. The premise is as such:

Why is the being of 10 compared to anxiety, authenticity, or the silence of conscience, and how they can be formulated?

First, let us re-examine the number.

We know that 10 is not prime. It is composite: 2×5. It is also not perfect: $\sigma(10) \neq 20$. It is not friendly: no known number shares its abundancy ratio $\left(\frac{9}{5}\right)$, and thus, therefore: 10 is solitary (as far as we know).

But it is not trivially solitary—like 3 or 7—it is a "situated" solitude: 10 contains communal components (2 and 5), but its disclosure does not align with any other being.

Its solitude is not pure, but paradoxical; and from this paradox brings us into anxiety and authenticity.

Now in *Being and Time*[5], Heidegger speaks of three concepts. These concepts are:

- Anxiety (Angst) is Dasein's confrontation with the nothingness of the world—it is not fear of something, but the ungrounding of all "somethings."
- Authenticity arises when Dasein owns its being-toward-death—when it stands apart from the "they" (das Man).
- Conscience is not a voice telling what to do, but a "call of silence"—a call from Dasein's ownmost possibility.

Let us map these concepts in our mathematical system.

First, Anxiety. 10 opens a world $(\sigma(10) = 18)$, but finds that its projection has no echo. The world it

discloses is real, and yet void of relational belonging. It has components $(1, 2, 5)$, but no reflection.

This is like Heideggerian Anxiety, where in *Being and Time* it states that[5:231]

'Nothing which is ready-to-hand or present-at-hand within the world functions as that in the face of which anxiety is anxious.'

So too, 10 does not fear a lack—it encounters a deeper un-belonging: a "ratio" without kin.

Thus:

$$\delta_{10} \in \mathbb{N} \wedge \neg\exists\, m \neq 10 : \frac{\sigma(\delta_m)}{\delta_m} = \frac{9}{5}$$
$$\implies Being(\delta_{10})$$
$$= \textit{disclosed but unshared}$$

We might as well write this formula that represents the Anxiety of 10:

$$Anxiety(\delta_{10}) \coloneqq \left(\frac{\sigma(\delta_{10})}{\delta_{10}} \notin \bigcup_{m \neq 10} = \frac{(\delta_m)}{\delta_m} \right)$$

Which means: the being of 10 projects a world without communal resonance—a numerical being-toward-nothing.

Despite its solitude, 10 fully discloses itself: $\sigma(10) = 18$. It does not mask itself in illusion, nor hide behind approximation. Its solitude is an act of standing in its ownmost being. It accepts its lack of fellowship.

Or, in Heideggerian terms, this is described as[5:352-255]:

'Authenticity is the resolute acceptance of Dasein's thrownness and projection.'

So too, in mathematical terms, the Authenticity of 10 is accordingly demonstrated as:

$$Authenticity(\delta_{10}):$$
$$= (Anxiety(\delta_{10}) \wedge \sigma(\delta_{10}) = \delta_{10})$$

That is: 10's solitude is not failure—it is acceptance of its own difference. It owns its projection.

And lastly, we come to the last part of this mathematical discourse, that being the silence of consciousness.

Likewise, 10 is a "silent" number, for it discloses its world, but no one answers, and its ontological call is heard only by itself. Yet this silence is meaningful—it is the ground of authenticity.

Because of this notion, let us thus define a new existential-mathematical formula:

$$Silence(\delta_n) :=$$
$$\left(\frac{\sigma(\delta_n)}{\delta_n} \in \mathbb{R} \wedge \forall m \neq n : \frac{\sigma(\delta_m)}{\delta_m} \neq \frac{\sigma(\delta_n)}{\delta_n}\right)$$

And thus,

$$Silence(\delta_{10}) = True$$

Therefore, δ10 is the number whose Being calls, but only to itself. Its world is real, but without kin. This is not a failure—it is a rare mode of mathematical authenticity.

Although all of these concepts are answered for the original question, it is from these three concepts, we can create a formula that represents these three concepts of being into one.

First, we state here that on all of these concepts, we can summarize it as such. The number 10 is:

- Not perfect ($\sigma(10) \neq 20$)
- Not relational (no known δ_m shares its structure)
- Not silent in voice—but silent in being

Thus, its Being resonates with:

- *Angst:* the clearing of world without relation
- *Authenticity:* standing in disclosed solitude
- *Conscience:* the silent return of one's ownmost projection

Hence, from these grounds and concepts, it can be summarized into a new formula for Being:

$$Being(\delta_{10}) = \\ Anxiety + Authenticity + Silence$$

Or, even more poetically, the end result of all these three concepts, in this case, the full essence of the characteristic of 10 as a Solitary number:

$$\delta_{10} = \epsilon_{solus} = \\ the\ event\ of\ being - without - echo$$

Which all culminates in the realization that 10's solitude is not a flaw but a revelation of its existential purity: a number that stands by itself, disclosing a singular world without need for relational affirmation.

Bibliography

Chapter One

[1] *Lamsa, G. M. (1986).* Holy Bible: from the ancient Eastern text: George M. Lamsa's translations from the Aramaic of the Peshitta. *Harper & Row.*

[2] *Nirenstein, S. (1924).* The problem of the existence of God in Maimonides, Alanus and Averroes: a study in the religious philosophy of the twelfth century. *The Jewish Publication Society Press. https://archive.org/details/McGillLibrary-121603-1387/page/n5/mode/2up?view=theater*

[3] *Zhu, X., Zhu, J., & Zhang, M. (2023).* A Brief Overview of the Big Bang Theory with Frontier Attachments. *Theoretical and Natural Science, 5(1), 87–94. https://doi.org/10.54254/2753-8818/5/20230305*

Chapter Two

[1] *Rovero, J. K. T. (2024).* The Basic Philosophy of Joshua Rovero. *The Rovero Estate. https://www.academia.edu/118165865/The_Basic_Philosophy_of_Joshua_Rovero_The_Basic_Philosophy_*

[2] *Schweitzer, A., & Campion, C. T. (1969).* Civilization and ethics. *London, Unwin Books, Published In Association With A. & C. Black.*

[3] *Latham, C. J. K. (1986).* Mwari and the divine heroes: guardians of the Shona. *Handle.net; Rhodes University; Faculty of Humanities, Anthropology. http://hdl.handle.net/10962/d1004666*

Chapter Three

[1] *Heidegger, M. (2013).* Being and Time *(J. Macquarrie & E. Robinson, Trans.). Malden Blackwell. (Original work published 1962)*

[2] *Sartre, J.-P., & Barnes, H. E. (1956).* Being and nothingness: an essay on phenomenological ontology. *Philosophical Library.*

Chapter Four

[1] *Lahti, E. (2019).* Embodied fortitude: An introduction to the Finnish construct of sisu. *International Journal of Wellbeing, 9(1), 61–82. https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v9i1.672*

[2] *Bee, R. L. (1989).* The Yuma. *Chelsea House Publishers.*

[3] *Soules, J. (2010).* For the Glory of Ahuramazda: The Political Effects of Zoroastrianism on Early Achaemenid Persia *(Undergraduate thesis, University of Wisconsin). University of Wisconsin Digital Repository. https://minds.wisconsin.edu/handle/1793/60912*

[4] *Brennan, J. P. (1998).* Peronism and Argentina. *Sr Books.*

[5] *Huntington, S. P. (1996).* The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order. *Penguin.*

[6] *Koneczny, F. (1962).* On the Plurality of Civilisations. *Polonica Publications.*

[7] *Molnar, M.* (2014). A concise history of Hungary. *Cambridge University Press.*

[8] *Minakov, M., & Rojansky, M. (2021).* From the Ukraine to Ukraine: A Contemporary History, 1991–2021. *Ibidem Press.*
https://books.google.com/books?id=cthSEAAAQBAJ

Chapter Five

[1] *Planas, A. (2023, May 23).* Florida man shrugs off losing arm in alligator attack: "It's not the end of the world." *NBC News. https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/florida-man-shrugs-losing-arm-alligator-attack-not-end-world-rcna85899*

[2] *Heidegger, M. (2017).* Ponderings XII–XV. *Indiana University Press.*

[3] *CBS Miami. (2024, September 4).* Florida man continues to adjust to life after losing an arm in an alligator attack. *Cbsnews.com; CBS Miami. https://www.cbsnews.com/miami/news/a-florida-man-lost-his-arm-after-an-alligator-attacked-him-heres-how-he-is-doing-a-year-later/*

[4] *Bhadury, A. (2024, November 11).* Meet The Scientist Who Cured Her Own Cancer Through Lab-Grown Viruses. *Health and Me. https://www.healthandme.com/health-news/meet-the-scientist-who-cured-her-own-cancer-through-lab-grown-viruses-article-151071502*

[5] *Corbyn, Z. (2024).* This scientist treated her own cancer with viruses she grew in the lab. *Nature. https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-024-03647-0*

[6] *Gigazine. (2024, November 11).* Scientist treats breast cancer by injecting herself with lab-grown virus. *GIGAZINE. https://gigazine.net/gsc_news/en/20241111-scientist-treated-own-cancer-viruses/*

[7] *Singh, A. (2024, November 12).* "Is It Ethical?": Netizens Divided After

Scientist Treats Her Cancer Using Experimental Vaccine. *Www.ndtv.com; NDTV. https://www.ndtv.com/science/is-it-ethical-netizens-divided-after-scientist-treats-her-cancer-using-6998545*

[8] *Heidegger, M., Fried, G., & Polt, R. (2014).* Introduction to metaphysics. *Yale Univ Pr.*

Chapter Six

[1] *Cafasso, J. (2018, July 16).* How Many Cells Are in the Human Body? Fast Facts. *Healthline; Healthline Media. https://www.healthline.com/health/number-of-cells-in-body#human-cells*

[2] *Cuemath. (2023).* Points and Lines - Definition, Examples, FAQs. *Cuemath. https://www.cuemath.com/geometry/points-and-lines/*

[3] *Cliffsnotes. (2024).* Points, Lines, and Planes. *Www.cliffsnotes.com. https://www.cliffsnotes.com/study-guides/geometry/fundamental-ideas/points-lines-and-planes*

[4] *Weisstein, E. W. (2025).* Group. *Mathworld.wolfram.com.*

https://mathworld.wolfram.com/Group.html

[5] *Heidegger, M. (2013).* Being and Time *(J. Macquarrie & E. Robinson, Trans.). Malden Blackwell. (Original work published 1962)*

[6] *Heidegger, M., Fried, G., & Polt, R. (2014).* Introduction to metaphysics. *Yale Univ Pr.*

About the author

"Never measure the idealism of a man based on his face, but his ideals and virtues instead."
- Joshua Kyle T. Rovero

I am the author of this book – which is my first one – is a living human person who wishes to contribute to the fields of the Humanities by expounding my own new Philosophy *as a new way of looking into the world*, from the perspective of my own new ideas. Building upon Heidegger's framework and using his to create new interpretations of the world (for which I am indebted to his philosophy and metaphysics; and theology as well), my ideas will be a staple for the re-enchantment of Philosophy across the world.

This, I am indeed a Philosopher; one that thinks in a new light.